SHIBBOLE

OR

Observations of severall Errors in the last Translations of the English & French Bibles.

Together,

with many other received Opinions in the Protestant Churches, which being weighed in the ballance are found too light.

Written by *Jobu Despagne*, Minister of the French CHURCHS.

And translated into English,

By *Robert Codrington*, Mr of Arts.

[illegible]

[illegible] in the year [illegible]

411 **Despagne** (John, 1591-1659, French Protestant, Pastor of London Congregation) Shibboleth, or Observations of Severall Errors in the last Translations of the English and French Bibles, sm. 8vo, *London, Printed in the Yeare* 1656, 4s

THE PREFACE.

READER, I am one of the least, but of those who are peaceable and faithfull in Israel; And amongst those I am not the first, who have undertaken to lay open those defects, to which the most learned are subject. Where is that Moses who still doth not stammer, although God himself hath talked to him? It is true, the Defects which I have here noted, are not so fatall in their consequences, as that of Shibboleth was unto the Ephratmites, Howsoever we should indeavour to correct our selves unto the truth, and to speak as uprightly and as properly as we can. Amongst a multitude of passages, and places which deserve a review, I have onely taken a small number, and have ranked them by no other order, but by that onely of my memory

and according to that measure which it hath presented them unto me. A work more compleat and exact doth pertain to the great Masters of knowledge, unto whom I do commend the care thereof. Nevertheless, If time, or rest, or life; if sight, or light, (and which is more) if the light of GOD doth not fail me. I hope I shall not be altogether unprofitable.

DIVERS

Divers Treatises heretofore publi-shed by this Author.

POpular Errors in Generall points which concern the knowlege of Religion, referred to their causes, and comprehended in severall observations.

The use of the Lords Prayer maintained against the Objections of the Innovators of these times.

New Observations on the Creed.

New Observations on the Decalogue.

The eating of the Body of Christ considered in its principles.

SERMONS

An Abridgement of the Sermon Preached on the 12. of *Sept.* 1648. Vpon the Treaty which was then to begin betwixt the late King and the Parliament.

A Funerall Sermon of the Author upon the Death of his wife.

A Funerall Sermon on the Death of *Philip* Earl of *Pembroke*.

An Advertisement on the Breaking and distributing of the Bread in the Sacrament of the Suppet omitted in many Orthodox Churches,

An Abridgement of two Sermons which preceded the Ordination of a Pastor in the French Church at *Canterbury*,

Considerations on the Eclips of the Sun, *March* 29. the yeer 1652.

The Charity of the Parliament of *England* to the French Church gathered in the Chapell at *Somerset* House.

The greatest part of the works above mentioned have been already translated into English by divers learned men.

SERMONS

SHIBOLET

SHIBBOLETH
OR
The Reformation of several places in the Translations of the French and of the English Bible.

Of a generall Fault in the Englisſh Tranſlation at the beginning of the Lords Prayer, and a great number of other places in the New Teſtament.

INſtead of ſaying, *Our Father which art in the Heavens*, the Engliſh do expreſs it, *Our Father which art in Heaven*, There are few who can be perſwaded but they

expreſs this Prayer in the ſame terms as our Saviour did dictate it. Nevertheleſs the miſtake is very viſible; If it proceeded onely from cuſtom and vulgar uſe, I ſhould not here make mention of it. But it is authorized by the publick Tranſlation, reviewed, and oftentimes re-imprinted. For all the Tranſlations of *Math.* 6. and *Luke* the 11. do with one voyce pronounce, *Who art in Heaven.*

I ſhall not here ſtudy at all to give an Anſwer to thoſe, who immediatly will reply; Is it not all one, If we ſay that *GOD is in Heaven* or *in the Heavens*? A man experienced in the Scriptures will never ſpeak it. The difference is very great betwixt Heaven in the Singular, and Heavens in the Plural Number; And although in ſome matters, the Singular be indifferently pronounced as the Plurall, as in *Math.* 16. and 19. and *Math.* 18. and 18. yet this difference is not univerſall. On the contrary, It is of great importance to diſcern, when the Scripture ſpeaks of

the

the Heavens, and when it ſpeaks of *Heaven*; Of which I will not treat at this preſent, It ſhall ſuffice to ſpeak, that the word *Heavens* in the Plurall, doth far more expreſs the extent of the power of GOD, whom in that Prayer we do implore; And alſo that Terme doth imply, that he hath all the Heavens at his ſervice to aſſiſt us, Not onely the Angels who are in the higheſt Heaven, but the Sun and the Stars alſo, which are in another Heaven, and beſides them, the Rain, and the Air which is alſo called Heaven. In the ſame Prayer, *The Heaven* in which the Angels do perform the Will of God, is diſtinguiſhed by the Singular number from *the Heavens* in the Plurall, which our Father doth fill with his preſence and his power.

But why ſhould I alleage Reaſons to maintain a truth, which cannot be denyed? He that is no extraordinary Grecian may underſtand well enough what are the terms in the Originall to which the Tranſlation ought to anſwer.

Is it *Our Father which art in Heaven*? No, It is, *Who art in the Heavens*. Wherefore then do we not ſpeak it ſo? Wherefore do we not tranſlate the word, as they are in the Original Text? Is it becauſe the language of this Iſland doth want a word to expreſs the *Heavens* in the Plurall? The contrary is ſufficiently known, as by experience it is evident. Is it becauſe the changing of one word, to which the people have a long time been accuſtomed, would appear either ſtrange or difficult. We ought to regard more the truth of God, then the cuſtom of men. And it will not be ſo uneaſy in a new Tranſlation, to change a ſuppoſition in the ſingular number, into a truth, in the Plurall.

Nevertheleſs, it is here requiſite, that I meet with, and prevent a ſubterfuge, which may be uſed, For it may be objected, The Evangeliſts themſelves repeating the paſſages of the old Teſtament, in which *the Heavens* are named in the Plurall, have tranſlated

Heav

Heaven in the ſingular number, As may appear in the 7th. of the *Acts* and the 46. verſe, in comparing it with the 66. of *Eſay* 1. To which I anſwer, That we are not Evangeliſts of ſuch a rank as they were, and that our Tranſlations proceed not as theirs did from the Dictates of the infallible *Spirit*, And when we render the new Teſtament into any other language, we ought to expreſs the very terms of the Evangeliſts, and the Apoſtles, And likewiſe when we tranſlate the old Teſtament, we ſhould repreſent the very terms thereof.

It is remarkeable that in all the New Teſtament the *Son* of God did never ſay, *Your Father which is in* Heaven, or *My Father which is in* Heaven, But alwaies, *which is in the* Heavens; *In the* Heavens in the Plurall. The Evangeliſts do recite a great number of the paſſages in which he hath ſaid, *Our Father* or *my Father which art in the* Heavens; But not that he ever ſaid, *The Father which art in* Heaven. Where-

fore then, Do we make him to change his ſtile in the Prayer which he hath preſcribed to us? But the Engliſh Tranſlation doth change alſo all the other places in which Jeſus Chriſt doth expreſs the *Heavens* in the Plurall Number, when he ſpeaketh of the Father.

To the ſame purpoſe, our Lord did never ſay *the Kingdom of Heaven*, but alwaies *the Kingdom of the Heavens*. One onely of the Evangeliſts hath this terme of *the Kingdom of the Heavens* no leſs then ſix and thirty times, but *the Kingdom of Heaven* not once; which plainly doth demonſtrate, ſeeing the multitude of paſſages, in which the Plurall number is alwaies imployed and never the Singular, that there is a myſtery or an Emphaſis in the one, which is not in the other. But the Engliſh Tranſlation to the contrary doth never ſay *the Kingdom of the Heavens*, but alwaies the Kingdom of *Heaven*.

Amongſt all the places of the New Teſtament, where the Original nameth

the

the Heavens, there are very few where the Engliſh do expreſs the Plurall. It is in their tranſlation of the 2 *Cor.* 5. 1, and *Heb.* 1. 10. Why ought it not to be, or could it not be as well, in all the other places which the holy Ghoſt hath dictated? And in *Epheſ.* 1. 10. where the Originall mentioneth *the* Heavens in the Plurall, the Engliſh Tranſlation doth onely put it in the Margent, and placeth the Singular in the text it ſelf.

Of Lucifer, *who is mentioned in the Engliſh Tranſlation* Eſay 14. ver. 12.

THe School-Boys know that *Lucifer* is a Latin word, and it is the name of the Star, which ſheweth its ſelf before the riſing of the Sun. The Hebrew which ſignifies this Star is indeed expreſſed it ſelf by the word *Lucifer*, but it is when we ſpeak in Latine, not when it is tranſlated into Engliſh. To what purpoſe then is this *Lucifer* in the Engliſh tranſlation?

The translators in the Margent have inserted the true word of the *English* tongue, which is the Day-*Star*, but in the body of the text, they had rather imploy the Name of *Lucifer*; as if it were better *English*, or as if there were some great cause which did oblige them to it.

It is indeed no other thing but the tracing of an antient Allegory, which applyeth to the Devill, that which is spoken to the King of *Babylon*, and of the Name of a *Star* hath made it to be the proper Name of the Prince of evill *Spirits*, and give it him in Latin, *that is to say* Lucifer. And because proper Names do retain themselves in whatsoever language they are spoken, it was beleived that this ought not to be changed for any other.

But wherefore do we yet retain the relicks of such notorious folly censured a long time since, and disavowed by our selves; who is he amongst the vulgar that finding in his *Bible* this word *Lucifer* doth not immediatly be-

lieve

lieve that it is the Name of a great Devill, whom common ignorance ſo calleth. It is true that the Divines, who have publiſhed the laſt annotations on the *Engliſh Bible* have alſo condemned thoſe, who do ſo underſtand the name of *Lucifer*. But ſo long as that word ſhall remain in the text, the error will continue. What need is there to retain a word which is not of the *Engliſh* tongue, ſince the *Engliſh* can expreſs the Hebrew without this Latin word, which onely ſerveth to nouriſh an antient folly?

The common people of *England* have a long time thought that the evill Rich man *Luke* 16. verſe 19, &c. was called *Dives* according to his proper Name; And for the greateſt part they do to this day believe it; for they ordinarily ſay that *Dives* is in Hell, that *Dives* ſpoke with *Abraham*, &c. As if *Dives* had been his Chriſten-name or at leaſt his Sirname: Now this ridiculous opinion was conceived and born at that time when the people had

not

not the Bible but in Latin; For becauſe that *Dives* doth ſignify a rich man in the Latin tongue, when mention was made of *Dives*, the ignorant did imagin that it was the name of a man; An interpretation as vain as that which is recited in a modern Satyre, of one, who maintained that the name of *Tobyes* Dog was *Canis*, becauſe, it is ſaid that *Canis* followed his Maſter. But it is to be admired how this ignorance hath been fomented even by the Orthodox themſelves ſince the Reformation, when they publiſhed the Scriptures in the *Engliſh* tongue, for in the Contents of the Chapter which they have prefixed to the 16. of *Luke*, we do yet read as if that Chapter did ſpeak of *Dives* and *Lazarus*. The laſt tranſlation hath not this word *Dives*; No more ought *Lucifer* to be any more eſpecially in the text it ſelf.

Of Mary Magdalen, *who falsly is said to be a Woman of a bad life. The injuries which Divines for the most part do her, in their Sermons and their Books, And especially the English Bible in the Argument of the seventh Chapter of* St. Luke.

THe injury which the Roman Church doth to another *Mary*, who was the Sister of *Lazarus* hath been sufficiently confuted by the Orthodox. Ignorance hath caused to believe, that this *Mary*, and another who was of *Magdala*, and the Sinner mentioned in the 7th. of Saint *Luke* were but one and the same person, confounding these three in one, now we have truly and already vindicated one of the three, who is *Mary* of *Bethany*, who was the Sister of *Lazarus*, but we do still defame her of *Magdala*, as if this *Magdalen* were the Sinner of whom Saint *Luke* speaketh.

There

There is nothing more common in the mouth of the vulgar then the wicked life of *Magdalen*. The Preachers willing to comfort Souls afflicted with the horror of their sins, do represent unto them this Woman, as one of the most unchast and most dissolute that ever was, to whom nevertheless GOD hath been mercifull. On the same prejudice which is but imaginary, the reason is builded, wherefore the Son of God being raised from the dead, did appear first to *Mary Magdalen*, before he appeared to any other, for it is alleged, it was because she had more need of comfort, having been a greater sinner than others. The common places, the Indexes, even that of *Marlorat* himself, and other Books, which serve for an Address to Students, do give them betimes this impression which alwaies afterwards they retain. He who hath wrote the Practise of Piety, of whom I shall speak more hereafter, doth rank this *Magdalen*, with the most enormous sinners, yea, with *Manasse* himself

himself, one of the most wicked that ever was. And yet more to authorize this error, it is inserted into the Bible it self.

For the Contents of the 7th. Chapter of Saint *Luke* in the English translation doth tell us, that the Woman, whose sins were in a greater number then the sins of others, the Woman, who untill then had led a wicked life and full of uncleaneſs, was *Mary Magdalen.*

But 1. the text gives no name to that sinner; where have we then found it? Who of the Evangeliſts, or what other Authentick Scripture hath taught us the proper name or the firname of that Woman? For she who poured the oyntment on Jeſus Christ *Mat.* 26. and *John* 12. was neither that sinner, nor *Mary Magdalen*, but the ſiſter of *Lazarus.* All the circumſtances do demonſtrate that they are two diſtinct Hiſtories, two divers actions performed in divers times, in divers places, and by divers perſons. Secondly, Where

ſhall

ſhall we find that *Mary Magdalen* did ever anoint the feet of our *Saviour*? Thirdly, Where ſhall we find that *Mary Magdalen* was a Woman of an ungodly life? The Goſpell doth inform us, that ſhe was tormented with ſeven Devils, or evil *Spirits*, an affliction which may befall the moſt holy man or woman in the world. But we find not the leaſt ſhadow of a word which doth ſtain her with any note of infamy. Wherefore then do we yet adhere to an invention not onely fabulous, but injurious to the memory of a woman illuſtrious in piety? We muſt abſtain from bearing falſe witneſs, as well againſt the dead, as againſt the living.

It is remarkeable that neither the ſinner, mentioned in *Luke* the 7th. nor the Adultereſs, in the 8th. of *Saint John* are found to have any name in the ſacred Hiſtory, no more than the theif who was converted being on the Croſs. There are (no doubt) particular reaſons for it, and in part we may conjecture of them, why the Holy Ghoſt

Ghoſt abſtained to expreſs the proper names of theſe great ſinners, although they were converted. It is not then for us to impoſe names on them, much leſs to appropriate them to perſons whom the Scripture hath not marked with any note of enormous ſins.

Of the Sons of Saul *whom the French Bible repreſents to have been crucified* 2 Sam. 21.

IT hath been obſerved that this word *the Croſs* is not found in the old Teſtament, and even that the Hebrew tongue hath not any terme to ſignify that kind of puniſhment, which was unknown to the antient people of *Iſrael*. The two and twentieth *Pſalm* foretelling that kind of death which Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, doth expreſs it onely by a Periphraſis. *They have pierced my hands and my feet.* It is true that the Latin tongue doth give a more large ſignification of this word *the*

Croſs, But in our vulgar tongues it is onely taken for that kind of Execution, in which they did nayl to the wood the hands and the feet of the Malefactor. And this cannot be ſaid of the Sons of *Saul*. The Originall affirms that they were hanged by the Gabaonits, who demanded that they might be delivered to them to be hanged. This is the word of the text, which is alſo expreſſed in the Engliſh tranſlation, In the place whereof, the French tranſlation ſaith, that they were ſtretched forth on the Croſs, And that the Gabaonits did demand them, to the end (ſay they) that we may ſtretch them forth on the Croſs. But the word of the Croſs, or the Crucifying is neither in that place, nor in any other of the old Teſtament, and therefore ought not to be in the tranſlation.

Of the beginning or Preface which is commonly added to the Text of the Decalogue.

WHen the common people do rehearſe the ten Commandements, they begin in theſe words, *Hearken O Iſrael*, &c. The Books in which the Extract or Copy of the Decalogue is found, The Catechiſms in which it is interpreted, The Poetical Paraphraſes in which it is ſung, do all give it this beginning, *Hearken O Iſrael*.

Now there is no man who ought to take offence at what I ſhall ſay. He hath more reaſon to wonder that no more heed is taken of ſo manifeſt an addition, For thoſe two firſt words, *Hearken Iſrael*, which we pronounce when we recite the Decalogue, are no part of the Decalogue it ſelf, nor were they ſpoken then when GOD with his own mouth did publiſh it in *Sinai*, neither were they

comprehended in the writing which he did give in the tables of that Law. This is easy to prove the Decalogue, which is wholy intire in two places of *Moses* (*Exod.* 20. and *Deut.* 5. hath not these words, *Hearken Israel.*

But what inconvenience doth arise to place them in the front of the Decalogue? Surely none at all, for the substance of them, for it is well known that it was to *Israel* to whom God did speak them. But it we shall affirm that they are the proper terms of the Decalogue, it is a great mistake, And the Jews would tell us that we are but bad *Text*-men. It is expedient at the least that the common people should be advertised to discern an addition, or a Paraphrase, be it never so pertinent, from the express words of that Law.

It may be demanded, From whence did that custom proceed, to begin the Decalogue with those words which are not there? It may be from hence that Christ (*Mark* 12. 29.) citing

Mose

Moſes (*Deut.* 6. 4.) ſaith, that *the firſt of all the Commandements is, Hearken O* Iſrael, *the Lord our God is the onely Lord.* But theſe words do not prove that the Decalogue in expreſs terms did begin ſo, No more then by this which followeth, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,* &c. *That is the firſt Commandement.* For theſe words, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God* are not in the Decalogue, although the other Commandements have their reference to it, as to the firſt, that is to ſay, the greateſt of them all.

To all this I ſhall adde that the French Paraphraſe, which we ſing in our Churches, willing to repreſent this Preface, *Hearken O* Iſrael, doth not expreſs at all the name of *Iſrael*, which nevertheleſs ought to be there expreſſed. And which is more, in the place of *Iſrael*, which was a title of honour, this Paraphraſe hath inſerted an Epithet of Reproach, which is *a hardned people*. No man ought to

take it in ill part, if we mark the de-
fect of the language of men

Of a distinction unknown to us which was in the writing of every one of the tables of the Decalogue. A Question on that Subject.

IT is not needfull in this place t
demonstrate, that which is eviden
in History, that the Decalogue wa
not contained in two pages, or Co
lumes, as it is ordinarily represented
but in four. For every Table was wri
ten on two sides, which were as tw
pages in one leaf, in such a manne
that all the Decalogue was compre
hended in four pages, every one o
which did contain a part of this Law
Exod. 32. 15.

Now we cannot give an account
what words, nay (which is more
what Commandement the first pa
did end, nor consequently where t
second did begin. For one part of

four first Commandements was written on one of the sides of the first table, and another part on another side. But how many of the Commandements, or words, and what were written in every side, is that of which we are ignorant. And the like for the second table; we know not where the first page ended, and where the other did begin. I have been willing to give this advertisement to those who before did not think of it.

But it may be demanded, wherefore hath not the sacred History marked this distinction to instruct us, which were the last words of the foregoing page, or which were the first of that which followed? It may be, it was to hinder those, who would have counterfeited the tables of the Law, for it was not permitted to make any like unto them. And these tables were shut up in an Ark, that they might not be exposed to the view of men; And so not knowing what words finished the first page

neither of one table nor the other, it is impossible to make a certain and an assured Representation of them.

Of the Songs which without any proof are attributed to the Blessed Virgin, to Zachary *and to* Simeon, Luke *Chap.* 1. *and* 2.

I May adde to this the song of the Angels, vvho (it is said) did sing these vvords, *Glory be unto God*, &c. vvhen they published the Nativity of our Saviour. This is a common opinion, followed also by the English Bible in the Argument of the second Chapter of Saint *Luke*. But that vvhich may be spoken of it, hath been touched by others, vvhich is the reason that I abstain to proceed any further on it.

Nevertheless, the same Judgement may be made of this title, vvhich is given to these three other parcels of Scripture, which are called Songs, As

the

the Song of the Virgin, the Song of *Zachary*, and the Song of *Simeon*. So ſpeak the *Comm n Places*, ſo the Commentators, and ſo *Calvin* himſelf as to the Song of the Virgin.

The *Evangeliſt* doth tell us that theſe vvords, to which the Name of a Song is given, were pronounced, but not that they were ſung either by the Virgin, or by *Zachary*, or *Simeon*, nor that they vvere ſo much as conceived or brought forth in the form of a Song, or meaſured by the Rules of Poetry.

It vvill not ſerve to affirm that their ſtile is Poeticall, and that certain paſſages in ſome of the Pſalms, and other Hymns of the old Teſtament are inchaced in them; for ſome verſes of a Song inſerted into a diſcourſe, do not make the vvhole diſcourſe to be an entire Song. Much leſs may vve conclude that it vvas ſung by pronouncing. Hovvſoever it vvas, there is nothing of any certainty in it, to make the vulgar opi-

nion to paſs for an undoubted truth.

In all the New Teſtament there are but tvvo *Songs*, ſo named in expreſs termes, And both thoſe are in the Revelations onely, and onely in a Viſion: *Rev.* 5. *ver.* 9. 10. and *Revel.* 15. *ver.* 3. 4.

I do not ſay that thoſe excellent words of the Virgin, of *Zachary*, and of *Simeon* may not in our vulgar tongues be put into the form of *Songs*, and ſung in our publick Congregations; It is of great edification. But it is not convenient to believe for certain, that they vvere *Songs* in the Originall. Wherefore do vve not ſay as vvell that the vvords of *Elizabeth* dictated by the Holy Ghoſt are a *Song* alſo *Luke* 1?

Of a very harſh expreſſion in the Engliſh Bible Jerem. 20. *ver.* 7. *And other Tranſlations on the ſame place in the Latine and the French Bible.*

IN this place the *Tranſlation* makes *Jeremy* addreſſing himſelf to GOD, to ſpeak in theſe vvords, *Thou haſt deceived me, O Lord, and I have been deceived.* It is true that the *Tranſlation* of *S:. Jerom,* hath the ſame expreſſion, if not a vvorſe, *Thou haſt* (ſaith it) *ſeduced me, and I have been ſeduced.* That of *Tremelius* hath it; *pellexiſti me.* And the French *Tranſlation, tumas attrait.* To which the Engliſh doth anſwer in the Margent. But in the text it ſaith, *Thou haſt deceived me.* A word full of horror. Now, ſaving the reverence which is due unto knowing and learned men, none of theſe expreſſions doth pleaſe me. The Queſtion is if the vvord in the Hebrevv doth ſignify nothing elſe

but

but *to deceive or to attract*. The Translators were not ignorant, that it doth signify also *to perswade*, to *induce* or *to give an Inclination*; which words may bear a good sence? Wherefore then in this place do not we imploy them in the room of others, whose signification is so siniſter. Wherefore do we put a Blasphemy into the mouth of the Prophet, vvhen his language might othervviſe be interpreted? In such a circumstance, the most favourable Exposition is also to be most received.

Of two Interpretations of one word which is in the 34. *Chap. of* Job *ver.* 36. *And which is the most convenient.*

IN this place the French Bible makes *Elihu* as addressing his speech to God, to speak in this manner. *My Father let* Job *be proved*. So the Latin Bible, And that also of

Junius

Junius reads it. The Englisſh Bible hath not theſe words, *My Father*, but in the Margent onely. For within the texe it ſaith, *My deſire is that* Job *be proved*.

This Diverſity doth ariſe from this, that the Hebrew word, vvhich begins this verſe, may be taken in both ſenſes. It ſignifies *my deſire*, It ſignifies alſo *my Father*. Now of theſe two ſignifications which ought wee to chooſe? For it is not ſo indifferent, that a man may think to take that which he pleaſeth:

It is and hath a long time been marked, that the faithfull of the old Teſtament, when they did ſpeak unto God, did never call him their Father. There is onely one Prayer in which he was called by that Name, *Eſay* 63. 64. For the reſt, Amongſt ſo many Prayers, ſo many thanksgivings, and Confeſſions, amongſt ſo many Pſalms, and ſo many Dialogues, betwixt God and the moſt holy men of that time, None of them

did

did ever ſay unto him *Father*, or *Our Father*, how great ſo ever was their privacy with him. It is true that ſpeaking of God amongſt themſelves, they acknowledged that God was as favourable to them, as a Father to his Children. God did call himſelf their Father, when he did ſpeak unto them, but when they ſpoke unto God, they did never call him by that Name. The liberty to cry *Abba Father*, vvas reſerved to the faithfull in the new Teſtament, *Gal.* 4. ver. 1 &c. according to the promiſe; *Jerem.* 3. ver. 4. and 19. We ought not then ſo eaſily to put this word into the mouth of *Elihu*.

There is yet another Reaſon which ought to reſtrain us from making *Elihu* to ſpeak in theſe vvords, *My Father*. For it is of a far greater ſignification, then when vve do call him *Our Father* in generality. It is known that in all the Scripture there vvas never any but Jeſus Chriſt onely, who ſpeaking unto God did ſay,

My

My Father. It is the Prerogative of the onely Son begotten of the Father. It is true that *David Pſal.* 89. ver. 7. doth recite the priviledge vvhich he hath received of God to be ſuch, that it doth inable him to ſay, *Thou art my Father*; But *David* did never directly call him ſo. And thoſe words which expreſs this preheminence, do properly concern Jeſus Chriſt, in the ſame manner as do thoſe in the ſecond *Pſalm*. *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee:* Wherefore then do we attribute to *Elihu* the language vvhich none ever ſpake but the Son of God onely; or what need vve to ſeek a Parallel which is to be found in no other place of the Scripture?

It is not neceſſary here to make mention of the French rythm in the 27 *Pſalm*, which ſaith, My God, my Father, teach me thy way, *&c.* For this word *Father* is not in the Originall. Neither will I in this place examin that in the French *Catechiſm*, *Sect.* 38. which ſaith, that every believer

liever can call God his Father in particular. It is neceſſary as much as can be, we ſhould keep unto the ſtile of the Holy Ghoſt: Otherwiſe the conſequences are greater then they appear to be.

Of a ſuperfluous word, yea a dangerous one, in many places of the Engliſh Bible, expreſſing the form of the Oaths recited in the ſacred Hiſtory.

THe Hebrews did ordinarily ſwear in theſe terms. The Eternall is living, ſuch a thing is, *&c.* The Examples thereof are frequent in the old Teſtament. The ſenſe is. The Eternal, who is living is witneſs of that which I ſpeak. And this Epithete, which they gave to God, was to diſtinguiſh him from falſe Gods, whom the Scripture calleth dead, *Pſal.* 126. 28. Now in all thoſe places, which are many in number, in which theſe words

words are contained. The *Eternall*, or, the Lord is living, The *Engliſh* Tranſlation doth prevent this oath, with a word in the beginning of it, ſaying *AS* the Lord is living, *&c.* The Bible of *Tremelius* hath alſo the ſame addition to render the Hebrew Phraſe more intelligible, which otherwiſe ſeemeth not to be compleat.

But this addition is not neceſſary, and if it were, yet a better may be found. The popular ignorance or liberty (when it will affirm the truth of any thing) will be ſo hardy as to ſay, That it is as true as there is a God, Or, As true as God is living. A word full of excceſs. For there is nothing that can be ſo true as that God is; All other truths are but the ſhadow of it.

It will be replyed that the difference is great between theſe two expreſſions. *As true as GOD is living*, And, As God is living. For this laſt doth ſignify nothing but a reſemblance and a conformity to the truth,

and

and not an equality. But First: This comparison is not in the Originall, and it is not necessary to say that these words God is living, do signify that any thing is as true as God is living. The sense is more full, That God, who is living, doth know that such a thing is true. Secondly, Although in the Original these words God is living are not joyned with any particle to the words following, and therefore did render the sense more obscure, yet I had rather in this manner to content my self with them, then introduce into the text an addition which is disputable. And so the French Translation (at least that which is most exact in such places) doth speak word for word according to the Hebrew.

The vulgar opinion touching the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt. The Contents of the twelfth Chapter of St. Mathew *in the French Bible.*

IT is a common ſaying that the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt is unpardonable. So ſpeak the Divines in their Sermons and their Books. But this aſſertion expreſſed in ſuch words is either defective or erroneous. Defective, If we preſuppoſe, that there is but one kind of ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt. Erroneus, if we underſtand, that all ſorts of ſins againſt the Holy Ghoſt are unpardonable. Both are but one.

Now this doth proceed from a groſs miſadvertiſement, which doth yet continue, For if preciſely we regard the terms of the Goſpel, in which our Saviour ſpeaketh of the ſin which is unpardonable, we ſhall never find that he pronounced this word, That *a* ſin againſt the Holy

Ghoſt ſhall be never pardoned. But he hath ſaid, that Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhall be never pardoned; Or that he vvho ſhall ſpeak againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhall have no remiſſion. The crime then which he hath declared ſhall never be forgiven, is not univerſally every ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, but onely Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt.

Certainly, we ſin divers vvays againſt the holy Ghoſt, vvhether it be in reſiſting, or whether it be in grieving the Spirit, or by what kind of offence ſo ever it be. Is there any one of us who can boaſt to have never committed any thing againſt the illumination, which the Spirit of God hath infuſed into his conſcience. Have we never acted againſt the motions of the *Spirit*? *To* luſt againſt the *Spirit*, is that alſo to ſin unpardonably againſt the *Spirit*? But where is that Chriſtian in whom the fleſh doth not luſt againſt the Spirit? Woe be unto us All, if every ſin committed

againſt

against the Holy Ghoſt were excluded from pardon. Is it not a ſin against the Holy Spirit, to make ſad and to grieve the Holy Spirit? Now the Iſraelites in the Deſart did grieve him oftentimes, *Eſay* 63. 10. Shall we dare affirm, that all thoſe ſouls who ſinned thus againſt the Holy Ghoſt, are for ever ſhut out from obtaining mercy both in this world and the world to come? To prove the contrary we ſhal find in the ſame place, that the compaſſions of GOD were even then upon them, ſeeing that his Spirit, which they had ſo much provoked, was ſtill their Conductor.

There are then many kinds of ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and amongſt others, one which ſhall not be pardoned, that is, Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt. But it is either forgetfulneſs, or too confuſed a ſpeech, to ſay without diſtinction or exception, that the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhall never be forgiven. The French Bible in

the Argument on the twelfth of Saint *Mathew*, ſaith that the Blaſphemy of thoſe, who ſpeak evill of the miracles of the Son of GOD, is a ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt. But theſe terms are ambiguous, and do not expreſs the ſenſe of the text. For Chriſt doth not ſay generally or indefinitly, that the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhall never be remitted, but it ſpecifies, and marks out that ſort of ſin, which ſhall never be forgiven; not any ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, but onely the ſin of Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt.

Of the Name which many give to the mountain on which Jeſus Chriſt was transfigured.

IT is ſaid that this wonder was wrought on Mount *Thabor*; And this ſaying is as antient as it is common. The opinion indeed is not without great appearance of truth.

For

For the ſituation of the Mount *Thabor*, the form, the beauty and the height thereof do all ſeem to ſpeak that it was the place where this great miracle was wrought. It was ſeated in *Galile* the leſs, in a champian place; it was round on the ridge thereof, it was equall on all ſides, fourteen furlongs in height, according to the levell. I do therefore willingly yeild to the vulgar opinion, provided it be ſaid to be an opinion onely, and not a certainty.

This tranſfiguration is recited four times in the new Teſtament, to wit by three Evangeliſts, and by the Apoſtle Saint *Peter*, who with his eyes did behold it. But none of them hath given us the Name of that Mountain. Their ſilence in this particular ſhould alſo ſhut up our mouths concerning this. No doubt, it was not without a ſpeciall cauſe, that the Holy Ghoſt abſtained from naming that place, ſeeing other places are named, which ſeem to be leſs conſiderable.

Nevertheleſs if we ſay that it was Mount *Thabor*, we ought not to pronounce it as an aſſured truth, as ordinarily it is done even in Sermons, and in our Books alſo of devotion, For they who ſay ſo, do ſpeak it as if it were moſt true, and not to be doubted, without thinking that it is an uncertain fore-judgement.

Of the Son of God whom the Engliſh Bible ſaith is mentioned by Nebuchadnezar. Dan: 3.5.

IN this tranſlation *Nebuchadnezzar* ſpeaketh, that of the four men whom he ſaw in the fornace, one of them reſembled *the Son of GOD*. This would make us to believe that *Nebuchadnezzar* did underſtand the myſtery of the Trinity, which nevertheleſs was obſcure in the old Teſtament. When we do ſay *the Son of GOD*, it is preſently underſtood that wee do ſpeak of him who is the onely Son of

the Father, But there is no appearance that this Heathen Prince did ſpeak in this ſenſe. The Prophets themſelves, when they touched on this point, have never expreſſed the name of *the Son of GOD* but in a figure, as in the perſons of *David* and of *Solomon*, or of the entire Body of *Iſrael*, *Mat.2.15.* Nay *Daniel*, from whom *Nebuchadnezzar* received all that he did know concerning the true GOD, did never in expreſs terms name the Son of GOD. Nay, ſpeaking of him, he reciteth that he ſaw him like unto the Son of man. *Dan.7.*

The French Bible doth otherwiſe render the words of *Nebuchadnezzar*. The fourth (ſaith it) is like unto *a Son of GOD*, to a man divine, excellent, extraordinary. So ſpoke the Pagans themſelves, when they would repreſent a man of rare qualities, whether of Body or of Mind. So the beſt Interpreters have obſerved, And ſo this place ought to be tranſlated. Between theſe two (the Son of GOD,

and, a Son of God) there is an infinite distance.

Of the Name of Children which was given to the three Companions of Daniel.

IN our vulgar tongues the Name of Child, when it is understood without any correlative, is taken for one of a very tender age. It is commonly said that the three Children were cast into the Furnace. And the Song which is attributed to them, is called the Song of the three Children. But certainly they were not Children then when they chose rather to be cast into the flame, than to adore the Image. Before that time, they were reputed amongst the wise men of *Babylon*, and they should have dyed amongst those who could not interpret the dream of *Nebuchadnezzar*. And before they were cast into the Furnace, they managed all the great affairs

fairs of the Province of *Babylon*, of which they were Governours. And were they yet but Children? The History also which recites the Martyrdom, from whence they were miraculously delivered, doth make mention of them as of men of age, and not as of Children. *Daniel* 3. ver. 12.21, 22,23,24,25,26,27.

Of the first words of the French Bible.

IN the Originall the first words of the Book of *Genesis* are couched in this order. *In the beginning God created the Heavens and the Earth.* The Scripture begins with the same word of beginning, so do all the Translations which I have seen, the French onely excepted, which saith, *God created in the beginning*, &c.

It may be said, that I stand here upon too nice a punctilio. For what doth it import, if we read it, God created in the beginning, Or, In the

beginning

beginning God created? It is true, It is the ſame ſenſe indeed : nevertheleſs beſides the generall reaſon which doth oblige us to follow the order of the originall words, as neer as the propriety of our vulgar languages will permit, there is a more particular conſideration on this place.

Saint *John* doth in the ſame manner begin his Goſpel, *In the beginning was the word*, &c. The firſt Syllables of the Evangeliſt do repreſent thoſe which are firſt in the Bible. And that this was his deſign, is evident by that which followeth. For immediatly afterwards he doth mention *that word by which all things were made*, and doth make uſe of thoſe terms which do manifeſtly reflect on the words of *Moſes*, when he deſcribeth the Creation of the world, And as this term, in the beginning, is the firſt in *Moſes* and in the Scripture, ſo it is firſt of all expreſſed by this Evangeliſt.

This Concurrence, which is ſo con-

ſiderab

ſiderable, doth not ſo plainly appear when we read it, God created in the beginning. It is moſt clear when we hear *Moſes*, who ſaith, *In the beginning GOD created*, And the Evangeliſt who ſaith, *In the beginning was the word*.

The Tabernacles of the Iſraelites being in the Wilderneſs, ill repreſented in the pictures inſerted in the Bible.

THeſe Tabernacles were Cabbins made of the branches of certain trees. Such were the lodgings of the Hebrews after their departure out of *Egypt*, untill they entred into the Land of *Canaan*. In memory whereof they were enjoyned to celebrate evey year a Feaſt of ſeven days, during which they lodged in Tabernacles made of the branches of divers trees, *Le.* 23. *Neh.* 8. But the Painters do make them of materials very

very different. For repreſenting the Iſraelites on the foot of Mount *Sinai*, or in ſome other place of the Wilderneſs, they do lodge them in tents which according to the painting were made of Linnen, or of the skins of Beaſts. So that the Figure doth not anſwer either to the matter or to the form of thoſe tabernacles of which we ſpeak, now in the pictures of many of our Bibles, we may ſee pourtrayed the Camp of *Iſrael*, and a certain number of Pavilions, ſuch as at this day are uſed when our Armies lye in the field: but they do in no wiſe reſemble the tents of the Iſraelites. Such a portraict doth diſguiſe the Hiſtory, and the Jews have a cauſe to taxe us for it of ignorance.

Of

Of the Name of Beelzebub *which is imposed on the Prince of the Devils.*

IT is known that the Jews gave him this Name, which is the Name of an Idol. And the Phariſes when they blaſphemed the *Son* of God, did call him after that Name. But when Chriſt did anſwer them concerning *Beelzebb*, he did not ſay as they, that *Beelzebub* was the Prince of the Devils, or that ſuch was the Name of the chief of evill *Spirits*.

We ought to know that the *Scripture* gives no proper or peculiar name to any of the evill Angels. *Some* of the good Angels, and onely one or two of them have a particular name, as *Gabriel*, and *Michael*, But the evill *Spirits* have but one common name as *Satan*, The Adverſary, The Devill, The *Slanderer*, And although there is a chief of the evill Angels, yet he hath not a particular name. *See Mat.* 25.41. We ought not then

to

to imagin with the vulgar, that *Beelzebub* is the proper name of the Prince of the Devils. It were the Phariſes, and not Chriſt that ſaid ſo.

Of Eaſter Day improperly ſo called or ill aſſigned.

I Diſpute not the antient cuſtom to ſolemnize one Day every year, in the memory of the Reſurrection of our *Saviour*, although that every *Sunday* is obſerved for that end; But as for that Day, which every year is celebrated, there is no reaſon to call it the Day of the Paſſeover; But rather (clean contrary) we ought to give that name to that Day in vvhich Chriſt our Paſchall Lamb vvas *Sacrificed*, to that Day in vvhich he dyed, and not unto that Day in which he did riſe from the Dead. For the word of the Paſſeover being applyed to Chriſt, hath reference to his Death, and not at all to his Reſurrection; ſo the

the Day which is called the Passeover, is not the true Day of it, but rather the contrary.

It will be alledged that every one doth so understand it, and that the words are indifferent, if they give an agreeable sense unto them. But wherefore do we give unto words a sense which they have not, nay a sense which is contrary to that which they have, or wherefore do we speak otherwise than we do understand?

Of the word the CROSSE, which is ordinarily abused, when mention is made of afflictions.

THere is nothing more common in the mouths of afflicted Persons, or of those who would comfort them, then to say that they do bear their Cross, and that their Cross is heavy, and man is subject to many crosses. But according to the language of GOD, there are no afflictions

afflictions which can be called croſſes, thoſe afflictions being excepted which men make us to ſuffer for the cauſe of our crucified Saviour, and for the cauſe of his Goſpel. To ſuch ſufferings God hath reſerved and appropriated this honourable title of the Croſs. In the like manner, the perſecutions which are raiſed againſt us for the cauſe of Chriſt, the puniſhments, the proſcriptions, the loſſes, the reproaches, and whatſoever a Chriſtian endureth for that quarrel, are honoured with this Name of the Croſs, by reaſon of the Communion which they have with the ſufferings of Chriſt, and more particularly of his Death. The afflictions which do proceed from other cauſes, have no part in ſo glorious an Epithete.

Nevertheleſs a man, who is chaſtiſed, or even puniſhed for his ſins, or by his Improvidence or Intemperance hath plucked an affliction on himſelf, will ſay that it is a Croſs which God hath ſent him. This is to

abuſe

abuſe the word. Such afflictions, and thoſe which proceed from hidden cauſes, as that of the man who vvas born blind, *John* 9. 2, 3. cannot be called Croſſes. And yet, this Impropriety is not onely in the language of the common people, but alſo of many Divines, nay, and in their Books alſo. For they do vvrite in their Books, that a wicked man hath his Croſs alſo. A great miſtake for the afflictions of a wicked man are not worthy of that Name. If he himſelf be an enemy to the Croſs, and is puniſhed, ſhall vve ſay that his puniſhment is a Croſs, can that be ſpoken of a Malefactor vvho ſuffereth for his crimes? All the afflictions even of a good Chriſtian are not to be called Croſſes.

Of crying sins which men do not discern from others.

THere are some sins to which the Divines have given the name of crying sins, And this Epithet is taken from the Scripture. By this name the effusion of Innocent bloud is called, because the bloud of *Abel* did cry unto GOD. So also is the abhominable sin of *Sodom*, *Gen.* 18.20,21. and 19.13. So also is the detaining of the hire of the labourer, *James* 4. 5. So also a House builded by rapine is called a crying sin, because it is said that the stones of the wall do cry out against it, *Habakuk* 2.11. And so generally all violence, and oppression is called a crying sin, *Exod.* 3.17. and 22. 23,27.

Now there are reasons wherefore these sins more than others are called crying. But without entring into the search thereof, we are not to think that this name ought to be given to all those

thoſe ſins, which are more enormous and exorbitant than others; for neither Idolatry, nor Blaſphemy, no, nor the worſhipping of Devils are called crying ſins: And in generall I do obſerve, that of all the ſins which do violate the firſt table of the Law, there is not one which is called a crying ſin. All thoſe ſins alſo, which are committed againſt the ſecond table, have not that name in the Scripture, but thoſe onely which I have ſpecifyed.

This diſtinction, although it oftentimes be too much neglected, even by men of knowledge themſelves, yet we ought nevertheleſs to obſerve it, if we will follow the language of the Spirit, and not that of the common people, for there is nothing more triviall than theſe words; you may here ſee, what it is that cryeth for vengeance, It is a crying ſin, And nevertheleſs the common ſpeak thus of ſuch a ſin, which the Scripture doth not put in the number of crying ſins. By

this confuſion there will be no ſin, which we may not call a crying ſin, if we will be governed by paſſion, by zeal without knowledge.

Of faults committed in citing the Hiſtories of the Antients.

I Will produce but two examples. A very famous *Scholar* in his Book of the truth of Chriſtian Religion, doth alledge an Author, who doth recite a very ſtrange ſtory concerning Jeſus Chriſt, which is that the Jews did chooſe him to be one of thoſe, who offered ſacrifice, and that they received him into their order, qualifying thus the *Son* of GOD and of the Virgin *Mary*.

This ſtory, if there were no other thing to object againſt it, doth directly oppoſe, that which the Apoſtle ſpeaks in the Hebrews, that our *Saviour* came from the tribe of *Juda*, a tribe, none whereof did aſſiſt at the

Altar

Altar, a tribe, of which *Moſes* ſpake nothing at all concerning the Levitical Prieſthood, that if Chriſt again were upon the earth, he would not be a Prieſt, *&c.*

Theſe fabulous ſtories which are uſed to maintain Chriſtianiſm, doe onely ſerve but to render it ſuſpected, nay ridiculous to the Jews, and other Miſcreants.

The other example is not of ſo great importance, nevertheleſs it will ſerve to ſhew, how the moſt learned do miſtake themſelves, men in matters purely Hiſtoricall, which contain nothing: but firſt that requires no exerciſe of judgement, but onely of attention. A modern Writer (whom I highly do eſteem) doth recite and follow, in this paſſage which I have produced, one of the greateſt perſonages of Antiquity, *Epiphanius* by name. This Author affirms that untill the twentieth age after the Creation of the world, there cannot any example be produced of any Son,

who dyed before his Father, *that is to say* of a naturall Death. This was put in becauſe *Abel* might not be objected againſt it. The order of nature was kept, that he, who was born firſt in a line deſcendant, ſhould alſo dye firſt, this continued untill that *Therah* the Father of *Abraham* did invent Idolatry, And then (the firſt that is marked out for an example) his Son *Haran* dyed before his Father *Therah*, *Gen.* 11. 28. By a Judgement untill then unheard of, God did puniſh *Therah* cauſing that his Son ſhould dye before his Father.

But all this obſervation is null, and proceeds from a great miſtake. For long before the days of *Therah*, nay before the time of the Deluge, we have the example of a Son, who dyed before his Father, and of a naturall Death. It is *Lamech* the Son of *Methuſelah*. The proof is moſt evident. Compare the 5. Chapter of *Geneſis*, ver. 25. with the 31. From the birth of *Lamech* unto the death of

of *Methuselah* were 782. years, but *Lamech* lived but 777. He dyed therefore five years before his Father, And by this account *Methuselah*, and not *Therah* was the first Father by whom we find that his Son dyed before him of a naturall Death; And by this the truth of this Commentary, which attributes the first example of this accident to the Idolatry of *Therah* doth vanish into nothing; many other defects may be noted in those who do recite Histories, for oftentimes it seeems they slumber when they recite them.

The first words of the ten Commandements, which the ignorance of some hath razed out, and taken away from the walls of their Churches.

THose men, who are not far from us, have made it no difficulty to blot out all the first words, to shew unto the eys of the people a Decalogue without a head, as if they had beheaded it; All these words they leave suppressed. *I am the Eternall, thy God, who have taken thee out of the land of* Egypt *out of the House of Bondage.*

I know not who hath moved them to beat down the Frontispiece of the Law of GOD, For, first, since we make a profession to retain all the words which GOD then pronounced, when he published the Law (as it is written that GOD spake all these words, *I am the Lord thy GOD*, &c. why do not we write them all? why do we raze out those which are the first?

first? Secondly, These very first words are the foundation of all the Decalogue, for they do mention who is this Lawgiver, and do shew the right which he hath to command. We cannot then omit them without taking away the fundamentall principle on which the whole Decalogue is builded. Thirdly, The sense of the first Commandement is not entire or compleat without these words, which go before it, and on which it immediatly doth depend. *I am the Lord thy GOD*, from whence it directly followeth, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me.* These first words are the soul of this Commandement, and they ought not to be disjoyned from it. Fourthly, It is unfit, and without Judgement to begin the Decalogue without this Preface, and to speak abruptly, *Thou shalt have no other Gods*, For this word *other*, doth presuppose that the Decalogue hath already spoken of one GOD, who excludes all other, And therefore this

ought

ought firſt to be expreſſed; without that it is to ſpeak as men, who have not ſo much as common ſenſe. Fiftly, Beſides all theſe defects, there yet remains one more enormous, which is a great ſolœciſm in Divinity, and by it an injury is done to all Chriſtians. For, when God ſaith, *I am thy everlaſting GOD*, he doth imply, I am thy Saviour. God never ſpeaks in theſe words, but unto thoſe to whom he doth preſent ſalvation. Theſe words are Evangelicall. God hath faſtned the Goſpell unto the entrance of the Law. Wherefore, if the Goſpell did not here ſpeak firſt, the Law would beat us back, and bear us down as perſons under the malediction. Thoſe then, who preſent us the Decalogue without theſe firſt words which do give us acceſs and a confidence in the mercies of the Law-giver knew not what they do.

Of certain pictures which are in some Bibles.

AT the entrance into the English Bible, Jesus Christ with his twelve Disciples celebrating the Passeover, are represented sitting at table, as we are accustomed to do when we take our Repast. But we know that Jesus Christ and his Apostles sate not then in that posture, and that their Table did not resemble those in which we set our viands. They did not sit but did almost lye along either upon some Cushions or on the ground, leaning upon their Elbows, as it is custom in these times in the Eastern Countries. The Originall text saith not that they sate, but doth make use of a terme which cannot properly be expressed in our vulgar languages. The French Bible in a more generall expression saith, he did set himself at the table, The English hath it, He sate down, and this word

word for the want of a better, and one more answerable to the Greek text, is tolerable in a translation. But a picture, which speaketh in all languages, ought not to corrupt the Histories in representing them otherwise than they are. The same picture doth very ill describe Saint *John* in the Bosom of Jesus Christ. The particulars are by so much the more considerable, because they concern some circumstances of the Supper of our Lord, and it is of great importance that we should understand them, because they do furnish us with Arguments against Altars, against the elevation of the Host, and the worshipping of it.

I will not here speak of the ignorance of Painters, who representing *Lazarus* in the breast of *Abraham*, do paint him as a little Infant on the Knees of that great Patriark.

Moreover in some Bibles of the old Impression we may see God represented in the form of a man, produ-

cing

cing *Eve* from the ſide of *Adam*. We may truly paint *Adam* or *Eve*, but it is impoſſible to paint God. Thoſe who have ſuch pictures in their Bibles, ought rather to take them out, then take delight to behold them. If it be unlawfull to have Images to repreſent God, much leſs it is permitted to have them in the Bible which doth prohibite ſuch portraictures.

Of

Of the Name of the SON of GOD, which some of our Bibles do give unto Adam, Luke 3. *verse the last.*

THe *English* Bible ſaith of *Adam* that he was the Son of *GOD*, the *Latine* tranſlation of *Beza* doth not give him that Name in the text, but the note in the Margent doth interpret that *Adam* was the Son of God. And ſome *French Editions* do ſpeak ſo in the text it ſelf.

But we ought to know that *Adam* neither in this, nor any other place of the Scripture, was ever called, *Son of GOD*, much leſs *the* Son of God. That Name doth onely appertain to the ſecond *Adam*. So the laſt French tranſlation doth not ſay that *Adam* was the Son of God, but that he was created by God.

In the Originall, the word *Son* is found but once, and it is onely ſpoken of Jeſus Chriſt. Obſerve how Saint *Luke* ſpeaks it, That Jeſus was the

So

Son (as it was esteemed) of *Joseph*, of *Heli*, of *Matthat*, &c. of *Zorababel*, &c. of *David*, &c. of *Abraham*, &c. of *Enos*, of *Seth*, of *Adam*, of GOD. The sense is that (according to the opinion of men) Jesus was the Son of *Joseph*, and that in effect he is of *Heli*, of *Matthat*, &c. of *David*, of *Abraham*, &c. of *Seth*, of *Adam*, of God. And thus (as many learned men have a long time observed it) it is Jesus Christ, and not *Adam* who is called the Son of God.

These words so often repeated *who was the Son, who was the Son*, which are added to every one of the persons who are named in this Genealogy in ascending from *Heli* to *Adam*. These words (I say) which are not in the Originall have caused divers to believe, that *Adam* is called the Son of GOD. But in all the Catalogue this word the Son ought to be referred to Jesus Christ alone, which without the addition of these words would be more easy to be understood, As there is no need of

that

that which in the French Bible is inserted touching *Adam*, to wit, that he was created.

Of the twelfth Stone which was on the Breſt of the High Prieſt, which the French Bible doth call a Beryll, and the Engliſh a Jaſper, Exod. 28. 20.

WE know that the Hebrew Nomenclation of precious Stones as of many other things, is at this day very obſcure, and the interpretations are very different, Nevertheleſs I will ſpeak one word on this place.

Two Reaſons do induce me to believe, that it was rather a Jaſper, than any other Stone. Firſt, Becauſe, it is the very ſame word in the Original text, for the Hebrew vvord of the Stone which is twelfth, and the laſt upon the Pectorall is a Jaſper; which vvord hath been retained in the Greek tongue (the moſt antient of thoſe

ſin

Babel) and hath passed into the Latin tongue, and divers other vulgar languages, signifying alwaies that, which we do call a Jasper. To this the Translation of *Junius* doth accord, who putteth the Jasper the last of all, in the like manner as doth the *English* Bible.

Moreover, This Interpretation is more apparent by a light which results from that place, *Revel.* 21, 19. The Heavenly *Jerusalem* hath also twelve precious stones, on which it is founded, and who do rest upon those of the Pectorall, but they are not ranked in the same order, for in that *Jerusalem*, the Jasper is the first stone, which is the last in the Pectorall, and this is not without a mystery, that the same stone, which is the last in the old Testament, is the first in the new, as joyning the two Testaments together, and making the end of the one to be the beginning of the other, so admirable a Concurrence, ought not to be taken away

from a paſſage where it is accompanied with other apparences.

Of certain Books written on the Revelation, and beleived to be prophetical.

THe Interpretations of *Napeir* on this laſt Book of the Bible have been a long time admired, but they have now loſt their reputation, for the term, which they gave to divers events that are yet to come, is already expired. Theſe miſtakes ought to ſerve to diſabuſe the vulgar, who oftentimes imagine that the conceptions of Expoſitors are infallible predictions. So divers men do to this day extoll *Brightman*, who hath alſo commented upon the Revelations, as if that man had the Spirit of Prophecy; Nevertheleſs, if we ſhall obſerve the applications which he maketh, eſpecially at the beginning, we ſhall find that he ſtragleth very much

if we will not take fancies for Oracles.

Of a prejudication common to a great sort of them, who do read or interpret the prophecies, especially the Revelation.

IT is ordinary to imagine that the Prophecies speak not but of our selves onely, or of our Countrey. If there be any prediction not yet accomplished, it seems to us that, *that* star is direct y over our heads, and the influence of it onely for our Climat, although(it may be)it concerns us not at all. Such a Prophecy, it may be, is not to be accomplished but in *Asia* or *America*, and yet we expect to see it fulfilled in our Northern Climate. From hence oftentimes it comes to pass, that our Interpretations hit not aright. I do confess that a great part of the Revelations doth concern our Western Countries, but all the pro-

phecies of that Book ought not to be reſtrained or applyed to this little corner of the World, As if the Holy Ghoſt had thought on none but on us onely. Or, As if God had no others, that are elected in other Countries of the world.

Of ſome Interpreters who cenſure Saint Paul *for wiſhing to be accurſed or ſeparated from Chriſt, for the love to his Brethren the Iſraelites.*

THe learned *Marlorat* in his common places, and the Divines, who have folowed and enlarged them writing on the word *peccatum*, and making forth thoſe ſins, into which divers holy perſonages were fallen, they do in that number comprehend the wiſh of *Saint Paul*, and without hæſitation do pronounce that, in that he was not without blemiſh.

But firſt of all, It is very dangerous

to condemn every action, or every word which is above the common Rule, for it may be authorized, yea and impoſed by him, who is above the Law, as was the Will which *Abraham* had to ſacrifice his own *Son*. *Such* Acts which otherwiſe would be irregular are heroicall and tranſcendent. *Secondly*, If we would fathom the depth hereof, we would ſay (as it is moſt true) that the Glory of God ought to be more precious to us than our own ſalvation; And from hence proceeded this wiſh of *Saint Paul*. Thirdly, The words which immediatly go before do ſufficiently demonſtrate, that the Apoſtle ſpake this by the *Spirit* of God, which could not erre, I ſpeak the truth in Chriſt, I lye not, my conſcience bearing me witneſs with the *Spirit*; That I have great ſorrovv, *&c.* For I would be accurſed, *&c.* *Shall* we ſay that, calling the Holy Ghoſt for witneſs, he immediatly afterwards did pronounce thoſe words which are con-

trary to the motions and the Rules of the Holy Ghoſt. Fourthly, If in that wiſh Saint *Paul* ſpeaks like a man that was beſides himſelf; If his words are to be reproved, Is not this to derogate from the whole Epiſtle, and to render it ſuſpected, as if it proceeded onely from man, and not from the Spirit of GOD? That of *Jeremy* ought not to be here objected, who in the midſt of his divine expreſſions, doth paſs ſo far as to curſe the Day of his Nativity; For the Prophet did record theſe words onely by way of Narration, to ſhew that they eſcaped from him; and his deſultory ſtile in this expreſſion is far different from Saint *Pauls* in this place.

Of a vulgar Book intituled the PRACTICE *of* PIETY.

I Have often admired at the folly of the common people, yea, and of many persons, that were conceived to be more judicious, who have almost adored this Book, and have made more account thereof than of the Bible it self. This little, which concerning it I have extracted, shall serve to disabuse those who will give regard unto it.

At the beginning the Author very magisterially, yea, and with terrible threatnings, doth advertise all sorts of people, yea, and the most learned without exception, *whosoever thou art*, saith he, who dost cast thy eyes on this Book, make haste to read it, for fear that before thou hast read it over, GOD (by some suddain Death) doth cut the thread of thy life; you see

then it is very dangerous to dye before this Book be read over, which is so necessary to salvation. O unhappy those who are dead before they can come to the last page! What Apostle hath ever spoken thus concerning his own writings? Is it less dangerous to dye without reading over the Bible at full? The Prologue of this man doth shew the excess of a Spirit which hath a marvailous opinion of it self.

But his work doth not answer to his boastings. I omit that which may be spoken on the generality of the Book. In many things he is defective in many superfluous, in some obscure, in others frivolous, and ridiculous, and which carry with them even a leaven of Popery it self.

First he describeth to us the torments of Hell after the manner of the monks very curiously, and as it were by parcels, so far as to particularize the ill smell of the Brimstone

which

which doth offend the Noſtrill. And ſpeaking of the Evill Angels, he calls them Furies, which is the Name that the Pagans give to their Infernall Goddeſſes.

Secondly he repreſents the damned ſoul, who doth accuſe the Body, and doth impute unto it the ſins which ſhe hath committed. This *Proſopopeia* is extracted from the Contemplations of certain Monks, who have feigned a Dialogue, where the damned ſoul reproacheth the Body with the faults ſhe hath done. And this ſmells of the Hereſy of thoſe who affirm, that the ſoul doth not ſin, but onely by the inducement of the Body.

Thirdly, According to the ſame Monaſticall ſtile, he deſcribes the diverſity of the Crowns in Bliſs. As the Crown of Martyrdom, the Crown of Virginity, which hath overcome the temptations of the Fleſh. The Crown of thoſe who are marryed. The Crown of good works for the givers of Almes (as if no other works

were

were good, but the giving of Almes onely,) &c.

He represents the faithfull soul incountring the Body at the Resurrection, to whom she makes this joyfull Complement. O welcome are you! O well met, my beloved Sister. These Indeerments cannot but carry a great Grace (no doubt) with them.

He doth make it remarkeable that the Virgin Queen *Elizabeth* was born on the Eve of the Nativity of the Virgin, and that she dyed on the Eve of the Annunciation of the Virgin. But who told him either the Eve or Day in which the Virgin was born, For as for that annual Feast, which the Church of *Rome* doth celebrate, there is no proof that it is the Day of the Birth of the Virgin, It is onely an ungrounded, and an uncertain tradition. In the same manner the Day of the Annunciation is unknown to us, because we know not the Day of the Nativity of Christ. And thus the observation of this Author is build

in the Ayr. And though it ſhould appear unto us that the ſaid Queen was born on the ſame Day as was the Virgin, and dyed on the ſame Day wherein the Angell appeared to the Virgin; could not the ſame thing happen to divers other perſons? And would not the ſame accident be as myſterious in every one of them?

It is very likely (ſaith he) that on the ſeventh Day, which is Sunday the world will end; And to this purpoſe he alleageth a tradition, which imports that the ſecond comming of Chriſt ſhall be on the *Sunday*. But the ſame Day is not *Sunday* throughout all the world. In ſome places of the world it is *Sunday*, when in other places it is hardly *Saturday*. In which Country then ſhall it be *Sunday*, when our Lord ſhall come. *Shall* it be in *England*, or rather in the Eaſt Indyes?

Speaking of Faſts he ſaith, that they were inſtituted in the terreſtrial Paradiſe, becauſe GOD did forbid *Adam* the

the fruit of the Tree of knowledge. On this account; First, *Adam* did faſt although he did eat of all the other fruits of the Garden. The Iſaelites alſo did faſt all their lives, becauſe many viands were forbidden them, although they did eat of others. By the ſame reaſon it may be ſaid, that a man doth faſt, even when he is eating. This is the language of the Church of *Rome* to ſay we faſt, when we abſtain from fleſh, although we then feed upon abundance of fiſh. Secondly, the Faſts of which he there ſpeaketh, had other ends than had the abſtinence from the forbidden fruit, For we faſt eſpecially either to promote or to teſtify our repentance; which could not be ſpoken of *Adam*, who had no need of repentance, becauſe he had not as yet ſinned, when this abſtinence was enjoyned.

Adam (ſaith he) was overcome by the Serpent, for having not obſerved this Faſt, But firſt, he ought rather to have ſaid, that *Adam* did not keep

this Faſt, becauſe he was overcome by the Serpent, *or to ſpeak more properly* by *Eve* already overcome by the *Serpent*. *Secondly* theſe words are doubtfull and dangerous to affirm, that the Fall of *Adam* did proceed becauſe he did not keep the Faſt, As if his ſin did ariſe from gluttony which is a groſs error.

This Book in the end thereof doth repreſent a Colloquy between the ſoul and her *Saviour*, concerning which take theſe parcels. Lord wherfore waſt thou covered with a Garment of purple ? R. Becauſe I take away thy ſins which are as red as *Scarlet*.

Wherefore was a Reed put into thy hand ? R. I am not come to bruiſe the broken Reed.

Wherefore were thy eyes blinded and covered ? *R*. That thy eyes may be opened from ſpirituall blindneſs.

Wherefore were thy feet and thy hands nayled to the Croſs? *R*. To embrace thee more affectionately.

Where-

Wherefore didſt thou ſuffer thy face to be ſpitted on? *R.* That I might make thee clean from the ordure of ſin.

Wherefore was thy ſide opened with the point of a ſpear. R. To the end that thou mighteſt find an entrance to draw neer unto my heart.

O gallant Demonſtrations; In all theſe anſwers, and in thoſe which are made to divers other queſtions, which I purpoſely omit, Is there any thing pertinent at all? Are they not meer extravagances?

Of the word AMEN which the people ought to pronounce at the end of publick prayers and Benedictions.

EVery one doth know that it was the practise of the antient Church approved and recommended by the Apostles themselves, that the Pastor having pronounced a Benediction, or a prayer, or the giving of thanks, all the Congregation, even those who were of the simplest people did make answer to him in saying Amen, 1 *Cor.* 14. 16.

It would be a folly to reply that they did not speak it, but in their hearts onely, or within their teeth. For, First, This Amen was spoken publickly to witness, that they did partake in that which the Pastor had pronounced. This Amen was spoken to express that which they had in their hearts. How had they expressed it, if they had not spoken it but in

their hearts onely? *Secondly*, this custom which the people had to close such actions with an Amen, was the very same as was practised in the old Testament, by which it is apparent, that this *Amen* was pronounced with a loud voice, 1 *Chron.* 16. 36. *Nehem.* 8. 6. *Psalm* 1. 16. 48. So in the first ages of the Christian Church, this *Amen*, when the Congregation was numerous, was heard afar off, as if it had been some clap of thunder, as the History doth inform us.

It is known that this custom by little and little, annihilating by the want of zeal, and coldness of the people in the service of God, there was one substituted, who in their Name should answer Amen. And this is practised even in the English Church since it hath renounced Popery. But because this *Amen* is not in the mouth of the people, it would be better to reduce our Churches to the Primitive and antient custom authorized by the Apostles themselves.

W

We who make a profeſſion of an exact conformity or correſpondence with the Primitive Church, wherefore do we ſuppreſs, that which ſhe ſo religiouſly hath obſerved in her Congregations, which is the pronouncing of this *Amen*. What difficulty do the people find in it; what excuſe can they make whereby they may be diſpenſed. Can it be objected that it would appear a novelty? Such a novelty is of great antiquity, and would be better than the continuation of a fault occaſioned by coldneſs in the ſervice of GOD.

In the Roman Church, where the publick ſervice is ſpoken in a tongue, which the people underſtand not, they know not in reaſon where to give this acclamation of *Amen*. But why do our Congregations refuſe this teſtimony of approbation, unto that which they do underſtand, and to which they do conſent?

Moreover (as it may ſo come to paſs) if Idolaters ſhould be found in

the Congregations of Christians, 1 Cor. 14.23.24. this *Amen* would serve to make a distinction of those who make a profession of Christianity, from those who being yet Pagans do not pronounce it. But in our Congregations at this Day, the Orthodox do no more pronounce it, than do the Idolaters that are amongst them.

Of the buildings of Jerusalem *represented in a Picture at the beginning of many English Bibles.*

THis Portraict is to be seen in the Corner of that sheet, which describeth the land of *Canaan*, where also the fields, and the way which the Israelites did go in the wilderness is represented. But their tabernacles or pavillions are all described, as they are also in many French Bibles at the beginning of *Leviticus*, as I have observed before.

As for the buildings of *Jerusalem*

it is known that their houſes were flat, and plain on the top, as they are through all the Eaſt, inſomuch that men might walk upon them, yea, and keep aſſemblies on them. The upper part of the Temple was made in that plat-form. Many paſſages of the ſacred Hiſtory will be incredible to thoſe who mark not this Architecture of publick and particular edifices, as *Judges* 16. 27. But this Picture in the Engliſh Bible doth transform theſe upper parts of the houſes, yea of the Temple it ſelf, into Pyramids, as if they were the heads of Bells. *Jeruſalem* was not builded in that manner. Such a portraict doth give a lye unto the Hiſtory, and doth deceive the common people.

Of the Tree of Life which hath been believed to be but one ſingle plant.

IT is a common prejudging that this Tree did conſiſt in one onely Individuall, which was but one in its kind, as we do ſpeak of the Phœnix. But in the laſt Book of the Bible which doth end there, where the firſt doth begin (although it be in a Spirituall ſenſe) we do read that the Tree of life was both in the middle of the place, and alſo on both ſides of the River, *Revel.* 22. 2. which could not have been ſpoken, if there were not more trees of the ſame kind.

A learned Man, who lately hath wrote annotations in Engliſh on the new Teſtament, did rather choſe to alter the ordinary reading of the place, than depart from the common opinion, which imports that the tree was one onely in her kind. The ſenſe which he gives to the text is this, That the tree of life did ſtand betwe

between the place and the River; The place being on the one ſide of it, and the River on the other.

This Conſtruction is indeed ingenious, and ſeemeth to be moſt naturall to the Greek text. But there is a reaſon which doth diſſwade me from conceiving it to be ſo. This Deſcription contained in the two firſt verſes of the 22. of the *Revel* is taken out of *Ezekiel* Chap. 47. 12. The Prophet there doth repreſent this River coming forth of the Sanctuary; which Saint *John* doth call the throne of God. He ſpeaketh there of the trees, which brought forth their fruit every month. He doth there make mention of their leaves, which were medicinall. It is there ſaid that theſe trees ſhall grow on the bank of the River on both ſides thereof. In all this Saint *John* accordeth with *Ezekiel*, But this correſpondence will fail, if it is ſaid, that the trees, of which Saint *John* ſpeaketh, is onely but on one ſide of the River. It is true that

Ezekiel ſpeaketh in the Plurall number of many trees, and that Saint *John* mentioneth but one which is the tree of life. But we know that the ſingular name of one kind, doth compreprehend all the Individuals to which that kind is common.

I will be replyed, that it is inconvenient to maintain that there were many Individuals of that kind of tree. And to prevent this inconvenience, this ſame Doctor, whom I do honour for his excellent knowledge, hath changed the ordinary reading of this place in the Revelations: But as for the inconvenience I cannot ſee what it is. Is it becauſe the Hiſtory doth not make mention of this tree as of an individuall? why, that is it which is in queſtion. Is it becauſe that this tree did prefigure Chriſt who is but onely One? But Chriſt hath been repreſented both by figures of divers kinds, as by the Cloud, and by the Sea, 1 *Corinth.* 10. and by many figures of the ſame kind, as by two Rocks,

Rocks, and a great way distant from one another, *Exod.* 17. 6. *Numb.* 20. 28. &c. Is it because the fruit of this Tree had a singular vertue to preserve the life of Man? It doth not from hence follow, that there should be but one plant onely, which should bear this fruit. On the contrary, As of all the Trees that were in the Garden, this here was most necessary for man: so it is to be believed that the liberality of God, which is ordinarily abundant in things which are most necessary, and which do wast away by use had given him more than onely one tree of that kind. Moreover, as the Tree of life was indued with singular properties, so had it the vertue also, as well as other plants, to multiply it self. But without affirming that there were many Individuals of it, I onely say that the contrary opinion hath no such certainty in it, that it may be received for an undoubted truth.

Of the Nature of the Viper marked in the table at the end of the New Teſtament in ſome Editions in French.

THis Index ſpeaking of this kind of Serpent, doth affirm that the young ones do eat their own mother to come out of her Belly by force, It is an old opinion indeed, but at this Day contradicted. Two modern writers both of this Iſle, and both very learned amongſt many other ſubjects, in which they are of a contrary opinion, have treated on this queſtion. One of them my intimate friend and a moſt reverend man is ſo amorous of antiquity, that he undertakes to maintain all the Paradoxes, which this opinion hath produced; and although that ocular experience doth ſhew us that Vipers are born without giving a Death unto their mother, yet he is pleaſed to make anſwers to it. But without engaging my

my ſelf in this difference; I will onely ſpeak one word on that which is in the Index, which I have mentioned. It is dangerous either in Interpretations or Annotations on the Bible, to lay down that for a certain truth, which is diſputable, eſpecially when there is experience to the contrary. Secondly, To what purpoſe, or in what regard was it ſpoken that the Phariſes, and the Sadducees, whom the Scripture calls a Generation of Vipers, had in their birth killed their mothers. Thirdly, if I were to expound ſuch places, I ſhould ſearch out the ſenſe in a propriety, which is conſtant and particular to the Viper onely, amongſt all the kinds of Serpents. All other Serpents do proceed from their Mothers, having neither their form as yet, nor any faculty to ſtir or to move themſelves. For the Creature is ſhut up in an egge, which the mother hath produced, and will ask ſome reſpite of time before it be hatched, But the Vipers are already

in

in life, and all formed when they come out of the Belly of their Mother. When the Scripture therefore doth give this Epithete of a Generation of Vipers to certain Men, It is to expreſs, that from their Birth they have already actually hurted, or that their malice was already compleatly formed.

Of thoſe who in the unfolding of a Text do believe that they muſt alwaies divide it into parts.

THere are ſome Auditors who beleive the Sermon to be without method, if in the beginning thereof, the Text be not divided into parts. But theſe people are not good Logicians, for there are points indiviſible and which will admit of no ſeparation. As in the Tabernacle there were moveables which were not to be taken down, or which were made all of one piece, ſo there are Texts which

do not ſuffer to be divided. Divers Preachers ſtriving to uſe it where it cannot be admitted, have fallen into irregularities not to be perceived indeed by the common people, but ſounding ill in their ears, who know the Laws of a true method, and of that alſo which is popular, to which it is permitted to be leſs exact than if the Auditors had been altogether compoſed of learned men.

Of

Of the divers Interpretations on the twelfth Chapter of the Revelations *verse the first.*

ALthough the Interpretations, which are above recited, do contain nothing in them but what is pious, nevertheleſs they ſeem to me to draw vvide from the mark. This place repreſents a woman environed vvith the Sun, having the Moon under her feet, and a Crovvn of tvvelve Stars upon her Head. This Woman is the Church, or rather the Church of *Iſrael*, which hath brought forth Chriſt unto us. But what means this Sun that invirons her, this Moon which is at her feet, and what is the ſignification of theſe tvvelve ſtars. Here inſtead of expoſitions, an Allegory that is propheticall is interpreted by Allegories that are Arbitrary.

That which is moſt received is this. The Church (they ſay) is cloathed with

withCeleſtial Glory as with the Sun. She treads under her feet the inconſtancy of all humane things ſignified by the Moon, who perpetually doth change. But this is not to interpret but vvithout proof to allegorize, For on the contrary, in the Scripture, which ought to be interpreted by its ſelf, the Moon is conſidered as an Emblem of firmneſs and perpetuity. As in the 89 *Pſalm.* It is promiſed that the throne of *David* ſhall be as the Sun, and that it ſhall alwaies be eſtabliſhed as the Moon.

Some modern writers (and thoſe very learned ones) do believe that this Moon doth ſignify the ſervice of the Ceremoniall Law, for the greateſt number of the Feſtivall dayes had their time, vvere marked according to the courſe of the Moon, And that in this ſenſe it is that the Church ſeeth the Moon under her feet, that is, the Ceremoniall Law aboliſhed. And theſe Authors do affirm, Becauſe the Moon doth rule by Night, and

that

that the ſervice of Idols is a work of Darkneſs; that the Church doth tread under her foot the Moon, that is to ſay the ſervice of Idols. But I am poſſeſſed with amazement that wiſe men ſhould give us ſuch Allegories, which have no ſolid foundation, and may be eaſily overthrown.

To ſpeak no more, this place of the *Revelations* doth interpret it ſelf by another from whence it is extracted. The portraict of this woman environed with the Sun is in part, the Copy of that table which is to be ſeen in the 37 Chap. of *Gen.* The Sun, the Moon, and the eleven Stars did ſhew themſelves to *Joſeph* in a dream. The Son was *Jacob* as he himſelf did interpret it. The Moon was *Leah*, who by the twelve Patriarchs had the place of a Mother. The Stars were the Brothers of *Joſeph.* Now this place in the Revelations doth repreſent the Originall of Chriſt, who according to the Fleſh was deſcended from this Family, which was compo-

ſe

ſed of this Sun, this Moon, and theſe Stars. If then theſe twelve Stars were the twvelve Patriarchs, (as it is moſt evident) it muſt alſo be, that the Son be *Jacob*, and the Moon be *Leah*. Otherwiſe this Portraict, which is taken out of the 37. Chapter of *Geneſis* will not agree either with the Original or with it ſelf.

Thoſe who take theſe twelve Stars for the twelve Apoſtles have no regard unto the text. The Church repreſented by this Woman is ſaid to have this Crown of Stars before ſhe brought forth Chriſt, when ſhe was yet in her travail, and undelivered. There was at that time no Apoſtles at all. It could not be then ſaid, that the Apoſtles were already the ſtars of the Church, for they themſelves were not then in being. So that theſe Stars could be no others than the twelve Patriarchs, nor the Sun any other than *Jacob*, nor the Moon than *Leah*.

Now the reaſon of the ſimilitude

will

will easily demonstrate in what sense it is said that the Sun doth inviron the Church, and that the stars do serve her for a Crown. All the difficulty consists in this which is of *Leah*, how it can be said that she was under the feet of the Church. The inconvenience, which appeareth at the first sight, hath caused, that in stead of *Leah*, there have been clean another thing imagined. For it hath been presupposed, to have the Moon under ones feet, doth signify to tread it under foot, either by mispriſion as a thing worth nothing, or by hatred, as a thing that is odious. But these words do not alwaies bear this sense. Sometimes they denote the power or authority that is exercised over one. So it is said that God hath put all things under the feet of man, *Psal.* 8. Sometimes they have reference to that which is as a supporter, or a rest to the feet of man. So by a metaphor it is spoken that God had a darkness under his feet. And in the same sense

it is ſpoken immediatly after, that he was mounted on the Cherubins. As for this Moon, ſeeing ſhe is adjoyned to the Sun and to the Stars, which repreſent the Glory of the Church, ſhe cannot be taken for a figure of contemptible things, and ſuch we tread on by diſdain. It remaineth then that this Woman, the Church of *Iſrael*, had the Moon under her feet, as ſuſtaining her ſelf thereon. Now it is not ſtrange to ſay that *Leah* was the ſupportreſs of the Church of *Iſrael*, becauſe ſhe had held it in her armes, and nouriſhed it from her Infancy. To this the Hebrew Phraſe hath reference. To bring up upon the knees. *Gen.* 30.3. and 50.23. *that is to ſay*, Of one who is charged with children, and who in nurſing of them, doth lift them up, as if they had their feet in her lap.

Of the brazen Serpent which hath been thought to be a figure of Christ.

I Have a long time followed this common opinion, which is believed to have been grounded on these words. As *Moses* did lift up the Serpent in the Wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up, *John* 3. 14. But since I have considered that this similitude was not between Christ and the Serpent) for such a similitude would be horrible and monstrous) but onely between the lifting up of the one, and the lifting up of the other; when it is said that the Lord shall come like a thief in the night, shall we say that a thief doth bear the resemblance of our Saviour? This similitude ought to be restrained to the point in which it doth consist.

Since that I have found some modern Writers who have gone before me, and have already shewed that the Serpent is not the figure of Christ

but that on the contrary it repreſenteth Satan over whom Chriſt hath triumphed on the Croſs. I have nothing to adde unto their reaſons, but one paſſage onely, which they have omitted, although it be expreſs upon this ſubject.

The Apoſtle ſaith, that Chriſt hath faſtned to the Croſs the obligation which was againſt us, that he hath deſpoyled Principalities and Powers (which are Satan and his Angels) and hath brought them to be beheld by all, and triumphed over them on it. *Col.* 2. 14, 15. Behold here then Satan, who was made a publick ſpectacle. Behold the Serpent, who hath been lifted up as a Trophy, and faſtned to the ſame Croſs, on which he was overcome by Chriſt, as our old Man, ſin it ſelf hath been crucifyed with Chriſt, *Rom.* 6. 6.

And thus all theſe Imaginary reſemblances, and correſpondences, which are ſought after between the Brazen Serpent and Jeſus-Chriſt do

vaniſh into ayr, And ſo many Sermons which have been grounded on it, are no more than Straw and Chaffe, too light to endure the tryall of the fire.

Concerning the Iews whether it were expedient to permit them to have an abood in England.

THis is that which ſome do affirm. But the Queſtion is not in Generall, whether it be lawfull for Chriſtian Eſtates to tolerate the Jews in their territories. On this ſubject many great men have written many years agoe. I will neither contradict nor debate their opinions, but ſpeak onely what belongs to *England*.

And yet the Queſtion is not whether it be lawfull, but whether it would be expedient to entertain the Jews here, at this time wherein we live. For all that which is lawfull is not expedient, And again all that which

which is unexpedient may become unlawfull.

ThePoliticians ought not to alledge their reaſons againſt this principle. If they were to be received we might as well juſtify the prodigious impiety of King *Henry* the ſecond, who conſtrained the Jews, who were made Chriſtians, to return to Judaiſm. The motive was Avarice. For the Jews, continuing in their profeſſion of Judaiſm, were more advantagious to him, than after the time that they were rendred Chriſtians.

But ſome may reply, we will call them to convert them. We will prepare the way for that great work, which God hath promiſed to do in them, to ſave all *Iſrael*. But obſerve in the firſt place. It is not ſo eaſy as we think it is, to convert the Jews. The Controverſies, which are betwixt them and us are full of Abyſmis, the depths whereof are unknown to the people; nay, and unto many who meddle in Divinity. Before we

undertake to reduce the Jews, we muſt be harder Students. Secondly, How ſhall we convert them being our ſelves divided into ſo many Sects, and giving the lye to one another? What would the Jews find, if they ſhould come amongſt us? A confuſion of language more great than that of *Babel*, an infiniteneſs of ſhameſull extravagancies, which are a ſcandall to all true Chriſtians. Will this be to convert the Jews? No, but rather to divert them from Chriſtianiſm. Thirdly, The people here are prone to receive all the follies which are preſented to them. The greateſt horrors are the moſt excellent myſteries. Is it not to be feared that many will learn to Judaize? and, to convert two or three Jews, a million of Chriſtians will be expoſed to the danger to become Jews? Fourthly, Although they will not all be ſo in generall, yet there will be many in particular, and we ſhall obſerve new Religions that will reſult out of the

mixture

mixture of Judaiſm with Chriſti-'aniſm. Who knows, what monſters will proceed from thence. All the precautions, which other States do uſe to hinder that Judaiſm corrupts not Chriſtians, are found too feeble there, where the torrent of an unbounded licence hath already in ſo many places over-topp'd and broken down, the bounds which ought to reſtrain it.

I ſhall alwaies wiſh that we travail to convert the enemies of the Faith, but without indangering thoſe who are of the Houſhold of it, For this were to do evill that good may come thereby, and God who knows both the time and the means, he will imploy for the converſion of the Jews, hath no need that we ſhould do evill for the performance of ſuch a good. It were rather to be deſired that thoſe Engliſh, vvho have ſuch an affection to the Jews, who blaſpheme the name of Chriſt, had as much charity towards ſome ſtrangers, vvho do here

profeſs the name of Chriſt, their own Country not vouchſafing them the liberty to exerciſe the Arts neceſſary for the ſuſtenance of their own perſons and families, unleſs they will abjure the Orthodox Religion to become Idolaters.

Of the Preſagers, who boaſt they have a prophetick Spirits. Of the follies and Blaſphemies which they produce.

WE have ſometimes ſeen in *Holland* one Doctor *Stephens* a Divine, who publiſhed a Book of his own, on one part of the *Revelations*, That which is ſpoken of Chriſt this man did attribute to *Frederick* King of *Bohemia*, who then lived. He alſo foretold that the ſaid Prince ſhould take the Pope and the King of *Spain* Priſoners, commence a Proceſs againſt them, and cauſe them to ſuffer under the ſtroak of the Executioner. Time hath ſince confuted this Doctor,

who

who notwithſtanding was diſcreet and modeſt in all other things.

About that time, there was at *Geneva* a Boy of twelve years of age, of honeſt Parentage, who took upon him to diſcover marvailous things, he diſcourſed pertinently and magnificently, which cauſed an admiration of him in all that heard him. Inſomuch that ſome excellent Divines were at a ſtand about it, doubting whether it were not an extraordinary inſpiration of God. But at laſt the Spirit, which made the Boy to ſpeak, did diſcover himſelf, for the Divill, vvho ſerved himſelf with the tongue of that poor creature did cauſe him to ſpeak the moſt ridiculous things in the vvorld, making mocks himſelf at the credulity of thoſe whom he had abuſed.

It is commonly ſeen that a knowing and a vviſe man is never ſo much admired as an ignorant fool, who ſpeaketh like a wiſe man, for we imagine that he proceeds from God,

when

when oftentimes there do come cauſes from him, vvhich are vvorſe than folly it ſelf. And it is a great ſimplicity to give more regard to one good vvord proceeding from the mouth of a frantick man, than to the knovvledge and wiſdom of him who is alvvaies diſcreet and judicious.

As for thoſe vvho counterfeit the Prophets, the vviſdom of God hath alwaies left ſome mark on them to be known to be Impoſtors. One dead Fly onely doth trouble and cauſe the vvhole perfume to ſtink, *Eccl.* 10. One onely Impertinency, vvhich is found in a prophecy, doth diſcover the falſhood of the Author. How much more if there be blaſphemies in it. Hovv much more if they be unnumbred, and in the ſwarm. At this day a ſenſeleſs fellovv hath dared to publiſh that there is none but himſelf alone, who hath the Spirit of Illumination and Inſtruction; That all Divines are in darkneſs, That many places which cannot be under-

ſtood

ſtood but of the Son of GOD onely, do ſignify a King mortall, which (according to the ſaying of that man) ſhall reign for ever throughout the world. That Jeſus Chriſt hath not been in poſſeſſion of this Kingdom untill the coming of this King, who nevertheleſs dyed ſome few years ſince: that this King is truly the third perſon, and whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt him ſhall never be pardoned. That in this King all the Scripture is accompliſhed. That the Elect are no where but here in *England*, and that they are confined onely to this Country. That the Liturgy of *England*, otherwiſe called the Book of Common Prayers, is the rule of the Spirit of truth, nay, and the onely Rule. That the Reformation of *Luther*, of the Calviniſts and Huguenots in *France* and *Scotland* and others, are but onely rules of Rebellion, like unto the Rods of the Sorcerers of *Egypt*. That the Saviour, who is ſpoken of *Eſay* 19. 20. is not Jeſus Chriſt, but another.

I would not vouchſafe to make mention of ſuch horrors, were it not that there are men of underſtanding, who do lend an ear to the predictions of ſuch ſenceleſs people, becauſe they meet ſometimes vvith ſome events which have followed them. To ſpeak no more, their Blaſphemies ſufficiently do demonſtrate what is the Spirit which doth dictate theſe prophecies unto them.

Of ſome falſe Miracles which have been held for true ones.

THere hath been in our time a flying report of a maid, who hath lived many years vvithout eating or drinking, It hath been beleeved for a truth, and on this preſumption, all the world hath cryed out a miracle. The Philoſophers, the Phyſitians, the Divines have been exerciſed on the queſtion; It there could be any naturall cauſe for ſo long an abſtinence. But there was no need for it, for it hath been verified and confeſſed, that this pretended faſt was but an Impoſture, and the greateſt miracle to be ſeen was the credulity of the people.

It is recorded that at *Cairo* in *Egypt* there is ſeen every year on a certain day a ſpectacle worthy of admiration, which is the Bodies of men, which appear ſome half out of the earth, others ſhewing their heads onely, and

ſome

ſome having nothing to be ſeen but their Arms or their Legs. The Evening before, their is no appearance of any ſuch thing at all, but the wonder doth diſcover it ſelf on the Morning following, and there are then to be ſeen pieces of Bodies, which in this poſture do ſhew themſelves as if they had been forced out of the Earth. They are all that day to be beheld, but if you return the next morning there is nothing to be ſeen. On the Day of this Prodigy (for it is yearly on a prefixed Day) they flock thither from all parts far, and neer to behold the miracle which hath been a fruitfull Argument for many diſcourſes.

For amongſt the divers cauſes which are rendred of it, there are ſome who report that heretofore in the ſelf ſame place the Pagans devoured a great number of Chriſtians, who were there aſſembled to pray unto God, And that every year ſince, on the ſame Day, in which the

Maſſacre

Massacre was committed, these imperfect and dismembred Bodies, do shew themselves out of the Earth, as if still they would attest the truth for which they were murthered.

This was a brave miracle, if it were a true one, but we ought to take heed that we be not too credulous. I have lately read the relation of an English Travailer, who hath been upon that place, and hath been a spectator of this pretended wonder. He saith, that as the Egyptians from all antiquity have been very carefull to imbalm the Bodies of the dead, they know a long time to preserve them either intire or in pieces (accordingly as time doth dismember and ruin them into ruin) and to carry them from place to place. Of such pieces is the foresaid miracle composed, for the Inhabitants of that Country who make provision for them, and with great care do keep them, do go once a year on a certain night to plant them in the ground in a a certain place, where

the

the next morning they may be seen to the great amazement of those who know not how they came thither, nor how after that day they disappeared. But those, who brought them the night before, do carry them away the night following. And the opinion that this is done by miracle, doth draw thither a great multitude of strangers, from whence great profit doth arise to the Inhabitants, which is the design of all the mystery.

Of the Curing of the Evill attributed to the Kings of England.

I Do not diſpute at all if there be any Royalty to which God hath annexed this particular gift to cure ſuch a malady, by the bare touch of the Hand, and the Intervention of certain Prayers, neither do I diſpute whether the Kings of *England* have this gift, or whether Royalty being ſuppreſt, the gift expireth with it. A hundred Queſtions might ariſe from hence.

I have here to produce on onely conſideration. Royalty may be deſcended to the Women, and there are two who one after another have reigned in *England*. And have theſe women alſo the miraculous gift to cure the Evill? If it be denyed, It followeth that this gift is not faſtned to the Scepter nor doth accompany Royalty. If it be affirmed, I have one thing more to alledge.

Amongſt all gifts ſupernaturall there are two which we read, were never communicated to any woman which is the gift of Languages and the gift of miracles. It is already a great Paradox, and unheard of in all the time of the old Teſtament, and the Primitive Chriſtian Church that a vvoman ever had the gift of miracles. Moreover as the ſupernaturall gift of languages was never communicated to that Sex, becauſe it is forbidden them to ſpeak in the Church, to vvhich the gift of tongues doth principally ſerve, ſo for the ſame cauſe, God hath not been pleaſed that any vvoman ſhould have the gift of miracles in that very time; vvhen they were both neceſſary and frequent. For as miracles did tend to confirm the Doctrine which was Preached, ſo were they not wrought but by thoſe men who had a charge to Preach it, vvhich vvas forbidden unto women.

Of an advertiſement which is put into the Margent of ſome paſſages in the Bible.

WHen the Annotators do meet with a difficulty in any place of the Scripture they ſpeak of it, that it is a thing vvhich ought not too curiouſly to be ſearched unto. But before we do forbid or reſtrain the ſearching after a point, we ought firſt to be aſſured that it is not in the Scripture. For this is not to be too curious to undertake to know that which GOD hath been pleaſed to ſpeak. Wherefore doth GOD ſpeak unto us, if it be not to be underſtood. Nay, when he ſpeaketh obſcurely in ſome places, it is to this end, that we ſhould yet ſearch more after it, and not that we ſhould recoyl from it. And if it be a thing which we underſtand not, it may be that others do or may hereafter underſtand it, whoſe labours we ought not to hinder. How

many paſſages are there which have been taken for Riddles, which are now clearly expounded. How many Queſtions have been held inexplicable which are now looſed and layd open. How many particulars, alluſions, and myſteries, which were not obſerved in the Scriptures, are now diſcovered to the great contentment of thoſe Spirits who are lovers of knowledge.

Of

Of the Dragon which was believed to be a flying Serpent.

SO he is painted nay and in ſome Bibles alſo, And it is a common opinion, that there is ſuch a kind of Serpent having wings. But although this be maintained by divers, there are no more ocular witneſſes of it, then of the Horſe *Pegaſus*. Nay it contradicts that which the Naturaliſts have obſerved which is, that there is no Bird which is venemous, for the providence of GOD hath not been pleaſed to give wings to creatures, which are venemous, And it is to prevent an infinite number of calamities which would come to paſs, if creatures ſo dangerous could fly, or move at randome in the traverſe of the Ayr. How many deaths not to be avoided would enſue hereby both to men and Beaſts? This Fiction of flying Serpents is tolerable, but we ought by no means to introduce it into the Bible.

It is moreover obſervable that the Scripture doth give wings to the Cherubins who repreſent Angels, but it never doth attribute wings to the Serpent which repreſenteth Satan. Adde to this, that in the 12. of the *Revelations* the Woman who fled before the Dragon, had wings given her to fly away, but the Dragon had no wings to fly after her, and all that he could do was to ſend a vomit of water lik a River from her gorge. It is therefore an Imagination in this paſſage to ſuppoſe a flying Serpent. Such a Serpent not found either in Nature or the Scripture.

Of the Serpent which tempted Eve *which many think to be presented in the face of a Woman.*

I Have already made mention of two learned men in this age, who are of a contrary opinion in many things which antiquity hath dictated. Behold yet one point more of which they are in dispute. Some hold that this Serpent which seduced *Eve* had the face of a maid, and so he hath been painted for a long time. One of these great personages rejecteth this opinion in this Picture. But he gives no reason for it at all, but onely saith that there being but two faces of mankind in the whole world that of *Adam* and that of *Eve*, if *Eve* had seen a third it had been suspected by her, and the Imposture had been discovered. To this the other doth answer in the contrary. Satan did take the face of a woman to be less suspected, because it was not so

ſtrange that ſuch a head ſhould ſpeak, as to hear a Serpent ſpeaking and reaſoning like a woman. And that *Eve* had no reaſon to wonder that a Serpent ſhould have the face of a woman, ſince there are divers Beaſts who are endued with ſuch a form.

Theſe two Antagoniſts have this common betwixt them, that contending on a matter of Fact, they would decede the controverſy, rather by reaſon then keep cloſe unto the Hiſtory, which ought to be preferred to all our own ſuggeſtions. Doth the Hiſtory then ſay, that the Serpent which tempted *Eve* had the face of a woman? Could *Moſes* who maketh mention of the great ſubtilty of this Creature have forgotten ſo conſiderable a particular in ſo great an Occurrence, as the Viſage of a woman in a Beaſt, Do other holy writers who ſpeak of this Serpent, ſpeak one word of this face vvhich is attributed to it? It is onely then an Invention of the Brain of man, which is ſufficient

ent enough to diſſwade us from receiving it.

But vvere it neceſſary to take off this difference by reaſons it is eaſy enough to decide the controverſy. Will any one affirme that there hath been extant any kind of Serpent, vvhich hath the face of a woman? No man can affirm it, And no man ever hath affirmed it, that I do know of. And if it ſhould be ſo, it could not prove that the Serpent which ſeduced *Eve* vvas of that kind ſince the Hiſtory makes no ſpecification of it. Much leſs can it be ſaid that it was a monſter compoſed of the face of a vvoman, and of the Body of a Serpent, For no monſters vvere produced till after the ſin of man, and ſin entred not till after the temptation of the Serpent.

We muſt be then conſtrained to affirm that this face of a woman was onely an apparition or a figure formed by Satan in the Serpent. But again, Was this Serpent but an appa-

rition

rition onely? Certainly the ſubtilty which the Scripture attributes unto him, above all the Beaſts of the field, cannot be ſaid to be an apparition or a figure formed in the Ayr. Will any man ſay that this reall Serpent had a face which was not reall but onely in apparence? This is a Serpent compoſed of a fiction and reality without any other proof but our imagination onely. Finally, will any man alleage, that Satan borrowed any one of thoſe creatures, who have a face like unto that of a woman? Why then that Creature had been condemned to the ſame puniſhment, as was the Serpent for having ſerved Sathan with its voice. But this not ſo, And the ſentence was not pronounced againſt any other Beaſt but the Serpent. To conclude, that humane face in which it is beleived, that the Serpent did ſhew himſelf is purely imaginary.

Of the discord which is in modern Musick, and more particularly of that in our Psalms.

THere are those who have desired that all our Psalms had but one tune, that so they may be more easy to the common people, Others do approve of the multitude and diversity of Ayrs, as the most delightfull, and most proper to move the Spirit. And certainly, the difference which is in the Psalms, as to the measures of the Hebrew verse, doth sufficiently demonstrate that there were diversities of Tunes. But because they are unknown to us, it remaineth that we give to every Psalm, yea to every verse that tune which shall be most convenient, and the most convenient is that which doth best represent the matter of which we sing. The voice which doth express a sad and mournfull subject, ought not to be of one tune, and the voice which doth express

a great joy ought to be of another. The voice alſo of him which ſpeaketh as an affrighted man doth differ much from the voice of him who is ſafe from danger, And generally the ſound ought not to be correſpondent to the matter, 1 *Cor*, 14, 7, 8. But although the Muſick of our Pſalms, (more particularly that of the French) be very excellent, and the ayrs be there conformable to the ſubjects in many reſpects, nevertheleſs it is not ſo univerſally over all, nor is there that perfection which may be deſired, and it is obſervable, there are divers Pſalms, the ſubjects whereof are of a contrary nature, yet nevertheleſs they have the ſame tune. The hundred and forty ſecond which repreſents the affrights and the crys of a man brought into the greateſt danger, hath the ſame ayr as the hundredth which expreſſeth nothing but joy and the giving of thanks. The ſeventy fourth is full of grief and lamentation. The hundred and ſixteenth

is as full of joy and thankfulneſs, yet notwithſtanding one is ſung in the ſame tune as the other. Nay in the very ſame Pſalm there is a verſe which corrects the matter of the precedent. In the one the ſoul ſpeaketh as beaten down with ſadneſs and maketh great complaints in the other (as if another perſon did ſpeak) the ſame is reprehended for the words it did ſpeak, and for its want of courage. Moreover there is oftentimes an alternative reiteration of theſe two Contraries which clap in betwixt one another, the Fleſh and the Spirit, as particularly in the 42, the 73. and the 77. Pſalms. Theſe verſes which repreſent contrary motions, although in one Pſalm ought to differ in the tune, inſtead whereof in every Pſalm we have but one tune common to all the verſes.

To this no other thing can be anſwered, but that it will be very difficult, and almoſt impoſſible to have a Muſick ſo exact and ſo univerſally correſponding with ſuch diverſity of

matters,

matters, and which (moreover) can be easy for the people to learn. This is true, so that I speak not to make any change in the tune, which is used in our Churches. In the Churches of *France*, we have undertook to give a tune to many Songs in the Bible, which have been as Psalms, and for that end put into Musick. But the common people being not accustomed to them, and disorder from thence arising we have been constrained to desist. That which hath ledde me to this discourse, is to speak of those who would reduct all the Psalms to one, and the same tune, when it would be more convenient to multiply, and to diversify the tune more then we do. And although it be impossible to put in practise a Musick so perfect as that which hath been spoken, yet it is not superfluous to have made mention of it, to the end that we may know how imperfect and how defective we are in that regard.

Of those who on the first day of the year do make a scruple to wish a good year to any one and of a passage which is in the French Bible.

THere are some even of those who are learned and Orthodox Divines who reject this salutation when it is given them. But for what cause? Is it forbidden to wish long life to our Neighbour? Certainly when the Apostle *Eph.* 6. 3. exhorteth children to observe the Commandement to which the promise is annexed to make them live a long time, he desireth that this promise may be made effectuall to them. If he doth wish them long life, that is many years. If it be lawfull to wish unto a Neighbour many years, wherefore not one year? And again can we wish him many years, without wishing him one year which is comprehended in many years?

Will

Well any one object, that the favours of God ought not to be restrained to a year? Why, this would be to restrain them yet more, when we do wish good morrow to our Neighbour, And yet no man condemns this salutation, for in wishing that the morning may prove happy, we do not pray that his happiness may expire with the Day.

That which gives distast is that this salutation is given in a Day which is presupposed to be the first Day of the year, when it is uncertain not onely on what Day, but also in what season the first year of the world began. But this very incertitude in which God hath pleased that we should be, doth shew that the knowledge of this Day is not necessary for us, and that it is indifferent to begin the account of the Days of the year, with such a Day which should be made choice of and received in use. If we should stay untill we know in what Day of the year the world began, we should de-

prive

prive our ſelves of many helps which are neceſſary for the meaſuring of time, and the affairs which are ruled by time; And if it be lawfull in whatſoever year it be to wiſh a good day to a Neighbour, wherefore ſhall this wiſh be unlawfull on the day in which we do begin to count the days of the year.

It will be objected that this Day is ſullyed with ſuperſtition, but there is not a Day in the year which is not ſo ſoyled. Ought we therefore all the year to refrain from acts of civility or charity? If on ſuch a Day ſuperſtition is more preſent to us, or more offenſive, the more ought we to correct that bad ayr by actions of a ſweet ſavour, not intermitting that which ought to be practiſed every day.

On this Subject I have made uſe of a paſſage which is in the French Bible 1 *Sam.* 25, 6. *David* did ſend this ſalutation to *Nabal* who did ſheere his Sheep. And ſo mayſt thou

make the year to come in the same season, &c. But these words are not formally in the Originall text, no more are they to be found in the English translation, nor in many other translations. Instead of all these words the Hebrew hath but one, *viz.* *To living*, And this word being not accompanied with any Noun Substantive, divers senses are given to it, but that which our French Bible doth give unto it is more forced and more far drawn.

Of the salutation which is given to those who sneeze.

THis is practised almost universally amongst all the Christian in the West. There are some nevertheless who not so precisely do observe that custome, as more particularly the English. And it is disputed if it be well done, to salute those who do sneeze in our presence. For neither

ther in the old Teſtament or the New is there found any Example. In all the holy Hiſtory there is not mention made of any but onely one, And this was the Son of the *Shunamite*, who ſneezed ſeven times in the preſence of *Eliſha*, and nevertheleſs this Prophet did not uſe any ſalutation to him. Some do beleive that this cuſtom did begin about one thouſand and fifty years ſince upon the occaſion of a Diſeaſe, which was then Epidemicall, in which men and women dyed ſneezing. But the Originall is far more antient, as it can be made manifeſt. It is certain that it had its Original in the time of Paganiſm, but the cauſe is uncertain. But preſuppoſing that it did proceed from Paganiſm the queſtion is, is it lawfull to practiſe it.

Our anſwer is grounded on theſe following hypotheſes, Firſt there are things which God forbids us to do, but nevertheleſs being done he willeth not, that they ſhould be un-

done. He did forbid that *Jericho* ſhould be builded again, yet nevertheleſs being afterwards rebuilded, he did not command that it ſhould be demoliſhed. Even ſome of the Prophets, as *Eliſha*, did keep there their Aſſemblies, and Jeſus Chriſt did there convert *Zacheus* and cured the blind. So God forbids to marry with a perſon that is an Infidel, but ſuch a marriage being made God forbids that it ſhould be broken. The league of *Joſuah* with the *Gibeonits* was not lawfull in all things; nevertheleſs God would not that it ſhould be infringed, and chaſtiſed the houſe of *Saul*, who had ill treated the *Gibeonits*. Secondly, That which hath been introduced for bad ends, being otherwiſe indifferent in it ſelf, may be applyed to other uſes. The cuſtom of imbalming the Bodies of the dead proceeded from the Egyptians, who did practiſe it either for ſuperſtition or for vanity; nevertheleſs this cuſtom hath paſſed amongſt the people

of

of God, who hath never reproved it. Thirdly, It is known, That we ought to distinguish of that which is lawfull in it self from the abuse which superstition hath mingled with it. The Example which the Apostle gives touching meat sacrificed to Idols, doth serve for this purpose, 1 *Cor.* 8. 10 I am of opinion that externall Actions, which belong even to the service of God, ought to be done with discretion of circumstances, nay, ought sometimes to be suspended. *Elisha* would not pray unto God in the presence of *Naaman*, 2 *Kings* 5. 10. 11. If I am constrained to pass before an Idol, I will abstain from pronouncing any prayer, because I will not give an occasion to any to suppose that my prayer tendeth to honour the Idol.

This foundation being layd, It is easy to answer the question. First to salute any, or to pray to God for him is not onely lawfull in its self, but also it is commendable. It can-

not then be evill, but by accident onely, either by the ſuperſtition of him who ſneezeth, or of thoſe who do ſalute him, or of others who are preſent, or on the contrary for the occaſion of thoſe who take offence to hear that ſalutation, becauſe they do beleive it to be ſuperſtitious. Secondly, If I am then in the preſence of any who is ſuperſtitious in that kind, I will abſtain from ſaluting any who doth ſneeze, to the end that I may not ſeem to adhere to ſuperſtition. And on the contrary, If it be in the preſence of any to whom this ſalutation is a ſcandall, I will abſtain alſo. Thirdly, But without the apparence of ſuperſtition, or of ſcandall, this cuſtom being no more practiſed for the imaginary cauſes which the Pagans had thereunto, but being converted into civility, it may be exerciſed without offence. The Jews were accuſtomed, when they beheld the Rainbow, to ſay their prayers, and to confeſs that they did merit a ſecond

Deluge

Deluge, and that they ſubſiſted not but onely by the mercy of God. If there were not any mixture in it of ſuperſtition, I ſhould make it no difficulty being in their company, and on ſuch an occurrence to ſpeak as they do.

Of thoſe who without any diſtinction do pronounce that Divines ought not to meddle with the affairs of State.

THis common ſaying is not true, but in ſome reſpects, and in others it is falſe, injurious to God, and pernicious to the State it ſelf. But becauſe the Queſtions, which on this ſubject do preſent themſelves, have been largely handled by divers learned and judicious Men, I will ſpeak but one word by the way. The affairs of State, and all other humane affairs publick or particular are conſidered, Firſt, Or in themſelves within their circuit, every one according

to the rules of its Art. Or, Secondly, within that Dependence which subjects them to the Law of God which is the Rule of Conscience.

In the first the Divine meddles not at all. He is a stranger in that Element. In navigation the Pilot is more to be beleived then Saint *Paul*, if this Apostle had not some extraordinary revelation.

But the irregularities which we may here meet with to the prejudice of God are under the cognizances of the Divine. It belongeth to him to prevent them by his Counsels, yea, and to reprove them if they are broke forth into action. Indeed, It belongs not to him to handle the weights and the measures in a shop, but if they are notoriously false, ought he to hold his peace under the pretence that he ought not to meddle with another mans trade? The Balance, The Beams and the weights are of the Jurisdiction of God, *Proverbs* 16. In this Island we complain of divers Divines

of

of the Court, who wink at certain innovations introduced under the pretence of the reason of State, and authorized by the Soveraign power which then was. But because these novelties passed for matter of State, it would be a wrong to have blamed the silence of the Divines, when they should be taxed for omitting that which they owe to GOD, to their charges, to the Church and to the State it self.

Of the Angell of Satan who buffeted Saint Paul, 2 Cor. 12. 7. *A new interpretation of that passage.*

MAny (as *Beza*) doth think that Saint *Paul* in this place doth complain that Satan kindled in him some inordinate affections. But this Exposition is contradicted by many forcible reasons which have been noted hereupon. Others take these words at the foot of the Letter, as if

in

in effect some evill Spirit had given buffets to Saint *Paul* tormenting him in his Body, as sometimes he had struck *Job*. Lastly, Some understand this of some wicked man, who by the instigation of *Satan* persecuted Saint *Paul*. And to speak the truth, it is not necessary that this Name, *The Angel of Satan*, should alwaies signify a Spirit. In the twelfth of the *Revelation*, the Angels of the Dragon (in the judgement of some knowing interpreters) do signify those that serve the Dragon as his Ministers. And so this Angell of *Satan* may be some man whom *Satan* imployed to torment the Apostle. But this Exposition hath need of a prop to sustain it, and this is it which hath obliged me to bring unto it this note that followeth.

The language of the new Testament is composed of an infiniteness of phrases, which do reflect either on the matter of the old Testament, or on divers other subjects. Now the

passages

passages, which contain such allusions, ought to be interpreted by them, otherwise we shall draw wide, or if we hit the mark it will be by accident.

I find then in the old Testament a History which is almost in all things the same with this, which St. *Paul* speaks of himself: in the 1. of *Kings* the 22. A Prophet saw GOD sitting in his Throne, and all the Army of Heaven about him on the right hand and on the left. He heard GOD proposing an affair, And the Angels, as in Councel, diversly debating of it. He heard a Commission which was given to Satan, which he promised to put in execution by his Emissaries. After so high a revelation, and the hearing of words so sublime, this Prophet is buffeted by one of the Messengers of *Satan* by a false Prophet who did strike him on the cheek. That History doth so much resemble this which Saint *Paul* reciteth of himself, that the allusion is most apparent, Now if the Analogy be entire,

he

he who buffeted Saint *Paul* was some false Apostle, who did persecute him. And so this quality of Angell o messenger of *Satan* doth not pertain to all sorts of persecutors, but to those onely amongst them, who carryed unto others the Doctrine of *Satan*.

Of a great number of places in the new Testament, which mention the curing of those who were possessed with Spirits, In which our Translations change the word which is in the Original Text.

THe Names of Satan, Divel, Demon, are the Epithets of evil Spirits, nevertheless they are not Synonima's, and the Scripture doth not indifferently express them, but doth make use of one of them rather than another, as they are more conducing to the occurrences or matter which are treated. The Name of Divel, and that of Demon are

in the old Teſtament, but are very frequent in the new, the language whereof is Greek, nevertheleſs theſe two words do paſs the one for the other.

When the Holy Spirit doth ſpeak of theſe evill Spirits, which the Son of God did caſt out of the Bodies of Men or Women, It doth not ſay that it caſt forth Divels, but that he caſt forth Demons, that he commanded Demons, that he gave power to caſt forth Demons, &c. From which word comes that alſo of Demoniack. Now ſince in this thing the Holy Spirit doth expreſs the word of Demon, and never the word of Divill, our Tranſlations ought to anſwer the Originall in the place, where we read that he caſt forth Divels, &c. It is true that this change is more tolerable in thoſe tongues, to which the word Demon is unknown, as in particular to the Engliſh Tongue, but ſince the word is become French, It would in thoſe places do better in the

tran-

translation then the Name of Divel.

I will make no stop at all to give satisfaction to the Question of the Ignorants who will demand, If it be not all one to read Divels, instead of reading Demons, In one word I shall tell them that we ought to read it according to the Originall. And without doubt there were reasons which obliged the Evangelists to make use of one of these words, and to abstain from the other, when they spoke of those Spirits, which tormented humane Bodies. Many (as the Saduces) did believe that these Spirits were not substances, but onely motions or Impulsions which come by nature. Now the word Divel which onely signifies a Slanderer, and can be spoken of a man also, doth not so well denote a spirituall substance, and different from humane kind. The word Demon is more significant in this regard, for it is the Name which the Pagans gave unto their Gods, who

in

n effect were evill Spirits. So the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 10. 20. 21. ſaith not (according to our Tranſlation) that the Gentiles ſacrificed to Devils, but that they ſacrificed to Demons. I forbear many other obſervations which might be made on this ſubject.

Of Bulls crowned with Garlands which are read in the French Bible, Acts 14. 13.

THe Originall text ſaith, that the Prieſt of *Jupiter* had brought with him Bulls, and Crowns or Garlands. But it dot not ſay that the Bulls were crowned with them. It is true enough that the Pagans were accuſtomed ſo to adorn thoſe Creatures which were the Victims in their ſacrifices by putting chaplets of flowers on their heads, or round about their horns. But that could not be practiſed in every ſeaſon of the year.

And

And as for the Garlands which are mentioned in this place, the History expresseth not that the Priest in that nature did make use of them. It may be, that he would have crowned with them *Paul* and *Barnabas*, as the Pagans so did honour their false Gods in their Images. And although that these Garlands were brought to crown the Bulls, yet the Greek Text saith, not that they were already crowned, but onely that the Priest brought with him Crowns, and Garlands. So speaks the Syriack translation and so (the Interpreter of the Syriack. *Tremellius*, and so also doth the English Bible. The French have followed the Latine translation of *Beza*, who in this particular hath not word for word expressed the Originall. This Note will not appear frivolous but to those onely who not, that there is not one jote in the Scripture, which is not considerable.

Of one word which the French adde to the end of the Lords Prayer.

WE ſay thine is the Kingdom, *&c. In ages of ages*; ſo we ſpeak in pronouncing that Prayer. So we read in our Books wherein it is written, and even in the French Catechiſm it ſelf.

But the Original Text, *Mat. 6.* 13. where the terms are expreſſed, which conclude that admirable Prayer, hath not twice this word Ages. It is ſo word for word. *Thine is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory, in ages.* Amen. This word *Ages* is there expreſſed but once, inſtead whereof we redouble it, nay with the addition of a particle which repreſents a change of the Caſe in the Grammars of the Greeks and Latins.

This Amplification brought into common uſe, proceeds from this that, there being other places of the new Teſtament, in which theſe words we

read. To him be glory *in ages of ages*, they have been taken as if they were the very ſame, which are in the end of the Lords Prayer, which notwithſtanding hath not this doubling of the word *ages*. This Phraſe, *in ages of ages* is of the ſtile of the Hebrews representing a Superlative, who would be called Eternity it ſelf, the longeſt Duration which can be imagined. This expreſſion is not found but in the *Revelat.* Chap. 1 ver. 6. and Chap. 5. ver. 13. 14. If any ſhall reply (as it is true enough) that theſe words *in ages*, in the Lords Prayer do ſignifie as much, as in ages of ages. I anſwer, wherefore then in reciting the Lords Prayer, do we not content our ſelves with the terms which are there? The excuſe is not ſufficient that we adde nothing to the ſenſe, For when we make profeſſion to tranſcribe, or to tranſlate, we ought to retain the words of the Originall, as far as our vulgar tongues are able to repreſent them without thruſting in any amplificati-

at all. I forbear to ſpeak that there is a ſecret reaſon for which this phraſe *in ages of ages*, hath been reſerved for the laſt Book of the Scripture.

How the word ages, *which is in the Originall of the Lords Prayer is tranſlated in the French and Engliſh Bibles.*

BEhold here clean contrary to that which I have touched on in the precedent obſervation, for in neither of the one or the other of theſe two Bibles, hath this Prayer ſo much as once this word *ages*, but in the ſteed thereof, they both ſay, For ever, or alwaies. Now although the terms are equivalent, if it be ſaid *in ages*, or if it be ſaid, For ever, nevertheleſs the word ages, in the ſtile of the Scripture, do include diſtinctions of great importance, which this Periphraſis doth not contain, and which I have not the leiſure to illuſtrate in

this place. The Engliſh Tranſlation is excuſable in this, becauſe the language hath not a word, which properly doth expreſs that which we call, *ages*. But ſince this word is become French, and doth better anſwer to that which is in the Originall Greek, it ought to be retained in the French Tranſlation of the Lords Prayer, as well as we have retained it in the other places in which it is employed in the ſame ſenſe, and in the ſame matter; *Revel.* 1. 6. and 5. 13.

Of the ſacrifice of Iſaac *ill repreſented in many pictures, and particularly in the front of the Engliſh Bible.*

Isaac is here painted on his knees before an Altar, and *Abraham* behind him holding a knife in his hand, which is lifted up to give the blow. But this picture is falſe, and doth belye the holy Hiſtory. For before that *Abra-*

braham did advance his arm, nay before he had the knife in his hand to ſtrike *Iſaac*, *Iſaac* was not before the Altar, but on the Altar it ſelf. The particulars of the action are recited to us in this order. That *Abraham* did build an Altar, and ranged wood upon it, that he bound *Iſaac*, and put him on the wood, and afterwards that he took the knife into his hand to cut his throat, *Gen.* 22. 9. 10. *Iſaac* was then on the Altar, not at the foot of the Altar, when *Abraham* did lift up his hand with the knife to ſtrike him. It is a great miſtake to frame a portraict which contradicts the Hiſtory.

Howſoever I ſhall note this by the way. This poſture in which *Iſaac* is repreſented having *Abraham* behind him, and holding a ſword in his hand doth cauſe many to beleive that it was to cut off his head, and it is alſo the common opinion that in this ſacrifice, *Abraham* would have taken away the life of his Son by taking off his head.

But this prejudging although antient, and very generall, is not so assured as it is imagined to be; and at least it ought not to be held for a certain truth. The Text saith that *Abraham* took the knife to cut the throat of his Son, now this word is not restrained to that which we call beheading; And moreover we ought to consider that *Abraham* had order to offer his Son as a Holocaust, In which kind of sacrifice, the victim was not beheaded untill after it were dead, For first of all the bloud was let forth, either at the throat, or at the breast untill the sacrifice was dead, after that it was cut in pieces, the head was severed from the Body, and the other parts the one from the other. This was the method of the Holocaust confirmed in *Leviticus*, 1 11.12.

Of the Catechism of the French Churches.

THis Catechism is no more perfect than any other of the writings of Men, I am not the first that hath

hath ſo judged. *It* is defective in many points. It is prolix and exuberant in queſtions, in certain matters where it ought to be more ſuccinct. On the contrary, it is too brief there where it ought more to enlarge it ſelf. *It* ſometimes diſpatcheth two Commandements of the Law, or two Petitions of the Lords Prayer in one Section onely, when every Commandement, and every Petition do demand one entire action, it mingles ſometimes in one ſection divers Articles of Faith, every one of which doth require a Section by its ſelf. There are alſo ſome tranſpoſitions; and articles not ſo commodious as could be deſired. *It* would be convenient to change the form in divers reſpects, for we ought not be ſo ſuperſtitious towards thoſe who have drawn up this Catechiſm, as to take it for a perfect Draught. We may retain it ſtill, but in ſome places reform it.

I do rather wiſh that our Churches had an Hiſtoricall Catechiſm, which

by Questions and Answers might re-present all the History of the Bible, at least the generalities of it, and the most illustrious particulars. Some English men have travailed in it, And if the work had been compleat it would produce a great benefit to the Common people.

But amongst so many Catechisms that are written, it were to be desired that we had one where the Doctrine of the Sacraments were better grounded than it hath accustomed to have been, For although a Catechism ought to be popular, yet we should not omit that which gives intelligence of the true ground of the matter. Of this I shall speak more largely in a particular treatise, if GOD permit.

Of the Common opinion that in the death of a man the soul comes out of the mouth.

WHen a man dyeth, It is said, that he hath his soul already

on the brink of his lips. So ſpeak the Divines, and ſo Antiquity hath ſpoken. This language proceeds from a popular opinion, that when the ſoul diſlodgeth from the body it goes out at the mouth.

I will not undertake to anſwer the curious Queſtions, which may be moved touching the coming forth of the ſoul. I onely affirm that this prejudging of the vulgar is not ſolid. If the ſoul be univerſally dilated in every part of the body, as many Philoſophers do affirm, wherefore is it locked up in a particular place at the departure? If it lodgeth properly and particularly in the heart, or in the Brain, what need hath it to come out at an open paſſage, ſeeing it is a Spirit which can paſs away, at the traverſe of the Skull or any other Bone. Now who hath told us, that it comes forth rather at the mouth than at the ear or eyes, which are as the windows of the ſoul? If I were at leiſure to affirm ſomething in a point,

the

the decision whereof is neither certain nor necessary, I should say that it is rather to be beleived, that as the soul of the first man did enter into him by the Nostrills, so it goes forth that way, *Gen.* 2.7. And certainly, when the Scripture would express that man is alwaies neer unto Death, it saith that the Spirit or the breath of him is in his nostrill, as being ready there to come out, *Esay* 2.22. To this the words of *Job* have reference, *Job* 27. 3. So long as the breath of the mighty God shall be in his nostrills, which is to say, when this soul it self, which God hath breathed into me, shall be upon the point of its departure, having no more hold of it, but in my nostrills onely.

Of the testimony which Josephus *the Historian of the Jews did render of Jesus Christ.*

THis testimony is found in the eighteenth Book of the Jewish antiqu

antiquities. This Author making mention there of Jesus, doth doubt if it be lawfull to call him a man, seeing the great miracles which he wrought. He also saith that this Jesus is the Christ. That at the third day after his death, he shewed himself to be alive. That such things, and other miracles were forespoken of him by the Prophets.

It is a long time since the Christians employed this testimony of *Josephus* to convince the Jews. But, not to displease so many learned men, antient and modern; I cannot perswade my self that this Jew, which gives not the least apparence to be inclined to Christianism, hath written so much to the advantage of our Religion; Would he so highly have published in his Book a belief of which he never made profession? And he is so far from acknowledging Jesus to be the Christ, to whom the Prophets did attribute the Segniory of the whole world, that, on the contrary, he gives

it to Vespasian a Pagan Prince, and applyes to him the Oracle which belongs onely to the Son of God. This is far off from acknowledging Jesus to be the Christ. It may be objected that if these words above mentioned were not the words of *Josephus*; it would follow that this Author made no mention of Jesus Christ in any place of his History, for he speaks not of him, but in this place onely which is in question. Now it is not believed that having undertaken to write of the memorable things of those times, he should in silence pass by the miracles performed by Jesus Christ, which were known to all the world. But this is not the onely Omission that is to be noted in *Josephus*. The Massacre of the Infants at *Bethlehem*, of which *Herod* was the Author, was so famous, that the Heathens themselves did write of it, and nevertheless *Josephus*, who hath recorded many other cruelties of this *Herod*, doth make no mention of it. And he is not

the onely Historian who by contrivement or otherwise hath surpassed some part of that which was most memorable in his time. And shall we wonder that a Jew, who never adhered to Christianism, should purposely omit the miracles of Jesus Christ? Was not his Resurrection contradicted by the Priests, although they were convinced of the truth thereof?

Nevertheless I do beleive that this passage was *Josephus* his own, but withall that some have changed some words therein, and this is not the onely writing, to which by the irregular zeal of some, such a thing hath happened. But for this in this place Saint *Ferom* who translated this Author into Latine, and who forgot not to value the testimonies, which the Jews and the Pagans rendred to the Christian Religion, doth make *Josephus* to speak otherwise, For he makes him not to say, that Jesus was the Christ, but that it was beleived

be

he was the Christ. *Josephus* then onely reciteth, that it was the belief of others, to wit, the Christians, but not his own, for he was not a Christian, and being not one, nor making profession of Christianity, much less could he say, that Jesus was the Christ. Now if one word in this place be changed, it is not incredible, but the contexture also of other terms is altered, in which this Author speaks of Jesus Christ.

Let us not think the Christian Religion to be less assured, because a Jew doth not confess Jesus to be the Christ. Truth needs not the suffrage of her adversaries. Nevertheless this passage of *Josephus* is advantagious to us in one respect. The Jews maintained that the Death of Christ was not under Pilate, who in the Name of the Romans (as they alledge) was Commander above one hundred years before; The consequences are far greater then they seem to be at the first appearance, of which I will

not ſpeak at this preſent. So great lyars are theſe malicious people proved to be by their own Hiſtorian, who in expreſs tearms affirmeth that Jeſus, of whom the Chriſtians took their Name, was crucified by Pilate.

Of the name Jehovah *which the French Bible marketh not in the twelfth Chapter of* Job *ver. 9.*

IN all the pleadings of the friends of *Job*, we never read of the Name of *Jehovah*, *Job* himſelf did never but once pronounce it, in this place above named, ſo that from the beginning of the 3. Chapter of this Book to the end of the the 37. the Name *Jehovah* is found but once, although divers other Names of God, as *the Strong*, *the Almighty* are there very frequent. I have not now to ſpeak wherefore the Name of *Jehovah* (the importance whereof is repreſented *Exod.* 6. 31.) is not at all in the mouth of the friends of *Job*, nor but once in the

the mouth of *Job*, many remarkeable conſiderations may hereupon be produced, *I* ſhall onely ſay, that, as we at leaſt ought to mark and diſtinguiſh this place, which is onely to be found, where *Job* expreſſeth this great name of *Jehovah*. And becauſe this name cannot be tranſlated into any other language, the new Teſtament repreſents it by the word Signior, And in the imitation of it is the Engliſh tranſlation of the old Teſtament. The French doth note it by another word, which is the Eternall: We diſpute not which of theſe names doth approach moſt neer to that of *Jehovah*. But ſince the French Bible doth repreſent it under the name of Eternall. This name Eternall ought to be in this place of *Job*, where the name of *Jehovah* is found, For it ſaith that it is the hand of *Jehovah* which hath made all things. Of *Jehovah*, that is to ſay of the Eternall, as the French tranſlation doth uſually interpret it. And nevertheleſs the ſame tranſlation

forge

forgetting it ſelf in this place inſtead of ſaying, the hand of the Eternal, doth ſay, the hand of God. A miſtake by ſo much the more remarkable, that in this place eclipſing the name of the Eternall, which repreſenteth that of *Jehovah*, it will follow that *Job* never pronounced this name of *Jehovah*. And having but once pronounced it, ſo much the more illuſtrious is this place, and ſo much the more important is it, to retain here this word, which doth diſtinguiſh it ſelf from all the other words of *Job*, and from thoſe of his friends, by a mark ſo much the more conſiderable that it is not obvious to the vulgar.

The word Heaven in the ſingular number is not found in any place of the old Teſtament. A difference in that reſpect between the Originall, and many tranſlations, eſpecially the Engliſh.

IT is known that neither the Hebrew nor Caldean, which are the originall tongues of the old Teſtament have this word Heaven, but alwaies ſay Heavens in the Plurall, or the Duall numbers. From hence it comes that in all the old Teſtament this word is never read in the ſingular number, and nevertheleſs the greateſt part of the Latine and vulgar tranſlations have introduced it in divers places, eſpecially the Engliſh, which doth ſerve it ſelf more often with the Singular then the Plurall; which is very ſtrange.

In the beginning of this treatiſe, I prevented ſome objections that might be made hereon, and I will not now repe

rily abused when we speak of afflictions page 47

Of erying sins which we discern not from others page. 50

Of the faults committed in citing the Histories of the Antients page. 52

The first words of the ten Commandements, which the Ignorance of some have razed from the walls in their Churches page. 56

Of some pictures which are in certain Bibles. page. 59

Of the Name of the Son of GOD which some of our Bibles give unto Adam, Luke 3 *ver. last* page. 62

Of the twelfth stone which was on the Breast of the High Priest, which the French Bible calleth a Berill, and the English a Jasper, Exod. 28. 20. page. 64

Of certain Books written on the Revelations and steemed as propheticall page: 66

Of a prejudging common to many of those who read or interpret the prophecies, especially the Revelations page. 67

Of some Interpreters who censure St. Paul for wishing to be Anathema or separated from Christ, for the love of the Israelites, Rom. 9. 3. page. 68

Of the vulgar Book, intituled, The Practise of Piety page. 71

the word, Amen, which the people ought

to pronounce at the end of publick prayers, and benedictions page. 79

Of the buildings of Jerusalem *represented in a picture on the beginning of many English Bibles* page. 82

Of the tree of life which was thought to be but one onely plant page. 84

Of the Nature of the Viper in some Editions marked in the Index at the end of the new Testament in French page. 88

Of those who beleive that in the unfolding of a Text they must alwaies divide it into parts page. 90

Of the divers sense given to the 12th. *Chapter of* Revel. *ver.* 1. page. 92

Of the Brazen Serpent which was thought to be a figure of Christ page. 98

Of the Jews; If it were convenient to grant them a residence in England page. 100

Of Presagers who boast they have a prophetick Spirit, and of the Follies, and Blasphemies they produce page. 104

Of some false Miracles which have been held for true page. 109

Of the curing of the Evill attributed to the Kings of England page. 113

Of an advertisement in the Margent of some places in the Bible page. 115

Of the Dragon which was thought to be a flying Serpent page. 117

Of the Serpent which tempted Eve, *which many think had the face of a woman* page. 119
Of a discord in modern Musick, and particularly in that of the Psalms page. 123
Of those who in the first day of the year do make a scruple, to wish a good year to any, And of a passage which is in the French Bible page 127
Of the salutation given to those who sneeze page. 130
Of those who without any Distinction do pronounce that Divines ought not to meddle with the affairs of State page. 135
Of the Angell of Satan who buffetted Saint Paul 2 *Cor.* 12. 7. *A new Interpretation on that place* page. 137
A great number of places which mention the cure of Demoniacks, in which our Translations do change the word, which is in the originall Text page. 140
Of the Bulls crowned with garlands, which are read in the French Bible Acts 14. 13. page. 143
Of one Word which the French adde at the close of the Lords Prayer page. 145
How the word ages, *which in the originall is in the Lords Prayer, is translated in the French and English Bibles* page. 147
Of the sacrifice of Isaac ill represented in many pictures, and particularly at the beginning

of